DEFENDING ‘DANGEROUS’ MINDS:
Reflections on the work of the Scholars at Risk Network
by Robert Quinn

Attacks on scholars and academic communities are not new. They date back at least as far as the 15th century when Greek scholars fled to Italy at the dawn of the Renaissance. Widespread persecution of scholars throughout Europe in the 1930s and 1940s is well-known. Fewer people realize that such attacks have continued right up to the present. In the 1950s and 1960s, the Cold War fueled purges of scholars throughout Eastern Europe, mirrored by anti-communist purges in America and elsewhere. The 1970s and 1980s saw anti-intellectual movements in China and Southeast Asia, and the rending of Latin America’s universities by civil wars and dictatorships. In the 1990s, African scholars and universities have suffered immensely from international and national conflicts and resource deprivation.

The Scholars at Risk Network exists to respond to such attacks. Its basic mission is to promote academic freedom by defending the human rights of scholars worldwide. Since it was founded in 2000, the Network has examined more than 450 cases and arranged more than 50 temporary visits to Network member universities and colleges for scholars experiencing persecution because of their work, prominence or exercise of their fundamental human rights.

Why are scholars attacked?

Evidence suggests that academic communities remain favorite targets for repression. In the information age, the scholar’s role in shaping the quality and flow of information in society is an unquestionable source of power. Repressive authorities intent on controlling societies naturally seek to control that power. Scholars are obstacles to these goals because the nature of their work requires the development of ideas, exchange of information, and expression of new opinions. Where the ideas, information and opinions are perceived by authorities as threatening, individual scholars are particularly vulnerable. Such scholars are labeled—explicitly or implicitly—as ‘dangerous,’ suspect, ‘disloyal,’ ‘dissident,’ or ‘enemy’ of the state, society, faith, family, culture, etc.

Examples of these types of targeted attacks are instructive. One professor of public health in North Africa published findings showing infant mortality at rates much higher than government figures. He was imprisoned. A political scientist from Southeast Asia and another from Europe published articles condemning violence by separatist movements in their respective countries, and calling for public rejection of violence and promotion of nonviolent conflict resolution. The former was assassinated outside his university, the latter survived an attempt on his life when a bomb planted in his car detonated too early. A sociologist from the Middle East conducted election monitoring with results strongly suggesting election fraud by the ruling party. He and more than a dozen colleagues were arrested, tried and imprisoned. In each case, the message of the scholar’s work was effectively repressed, at least within the scholar’s home country.

But what if the expressive activity that triggers the attack is not directly related to the scholar’s work? Physicists, for example, frequently find themselves harassed and even imprisoned but almost never as a result of their physics. Rather, in naturally pursuing their academic research they need contact with laboratories and colleagues in other countries. When authorities excessively restrict travel and other means of collaboration, dedicated scholars may begin publicly calling for greater openness, transparency and liberalization.

Sometimes it is not the scholar’s conduct at all but his or her status that triggers an attack. Because of their education, frequent travel and professional status scholars are often prominent members of their community. This is especially true where a scholar is a member of a political, ethnic or religious minority, for female scholars and for scholars in developing countries where opportunities for advanced education are dearly limited. In these circumstances, an attack on an individual scholar may be a highly visible, highly efficient means for a repressive agent to intimidate and silence an entire community of people.

Most difficult are those situations where a scholar suffers very real threats to his or her security but where these same threats are experienced by the community in general: situations of internal armed, civil or...
international wars for example, where masses of persons are threatened with random violence.

Who is behind these attacks?

There is a tendency to assume that attacks on scholars are committed by a repressive state power—a dictator or junta. And sometimes that perception is correct. But the defense of academic freedom requires a more studied model. In some places the repressive agent is only one branch or wing of a government, like the military, the secret police, a ruling political party or sub-national authority. At other times it may be a non-government agent, including militants and paramilitaries. (Indeed, in some places scholars have come under attack from both the left, in the form of left-wing armed guerilla movements, and the right, in the form of armed paramilitary death squads.) These also include religious authorities, criminal organizations or even otherwise-legal commercial enterprises.

What types of attacks are we talking about?

While any given scholar may suffer one or more types of incidents, frequently scholars experience a "dynamic of isolation," a pattern of incidents which escalate in intensity leaving a scholar alone and vulnerable to more serious, more violent attacks. For example a scholar typically will initially suffer some form of harassment, including perhaps warnings and surveillance. This may escalate to denial of accesses or permissions, confiscation of notes and computers, professional or personal slander or defamation, or even physical or sexual intimidation. Somewhere along the way the scholar’s colleagues may themselves be warned to avoid the scholar, or may do so themselves, so as to avoid a similar fate. This leaves the scholar increasingly vulnerable to more serious pressures, including arbitrary dismissal, exile, arrest on false charges, detention with or without trial, imprisonment, even torture, disappearance and death.

Also worth noting are the types of wider attacks suffered by university communities as a whole. These include ideological pressure and censorship (including imposition of approved national ideology, book burning and ideological revisionism), closing of schools and universities, suppression of strikes/protests, restrictions on travel and exchange of information, discriminatory restrictions on academic resources including discrimination against women, indigenous peoples, and cultural or ethnic minorities.

Why do we care about attacks on scholars?

This is a question really in two parts. First, why should we care about scholars and academic freedom at all? In sum, we should care about increasing the quality and flow of information and understanding in the world, and academic freedom and scholarship promote these goals. Moreover, by defending scholars and promoting academic freedom in other countries, we invariably open discussions of the importance of academic freedom in our own communities. The results of which can only be constructive.

Second, and more difficult, is the question of why we should care about any particular scholars from countries other than our own. One simple answer is because their lives are at risk and we have the ability to save their lives.

Deeper answers are found in the reasons scholars are attacked. Scholars at Risk works not only to save lives but to save important voices. In those cases where scholars are attacked for the content of their work, we should ask ourselves what it is about that work that a state or other agent finds so threatening? More often than not, we will find truth and merit in the ideas or opinions expressed. By responding to these attacks, we gain insight and understanding for ourselves and help preserve the local intellectual capital of societies under threat.

When scholars are attacked as examples or to chill wider society, our efforts not only preserve voices but may help to forestall wider violations. Evidence from a number of countries strongly suggests that attacks on intellectuals precede wider violations of rights generally. By paying attention to these attacks on scholars early on, we may help to sound an alarm which can help to delay or forestall attacks on the wider community. At a minimum, by vigorously responding to attacks we raise the cost of the attack to the oppressors, which taxes their resources and over time may reduce their severity and frequency.

Finally, by responding to attacks Scholars at Risk and its member-institutions build solidarity within the global academic community. Through the Network, academic communities are directly involved in the defense of academic communities. Recognizing that a threat to freedom of thought and opinion anywhere is a threat to these freedoms everywhere, Scholars at Risk and its members give concrete example to a better, brighter future.

What can be done about these attacks?

Scholars at Risk’s experience indicates that a great deal can be done to reduce the severity and frequency of attacks. This is because of the simple fact that the primary tool of repressive agents is isolation, not violence.

Yes, violence is attendant to many attacks on scholars. Too many have been beaten, tortured, and even killed. But violence is often secondary. The primary tool of repressive agents is to isolate scholars, removing from society their voices, their thoughts, their ideas. Only the most clumsy of agents resort to open, physical elimination of individuals. The more sophisticated oppressors, use more subtle means of isolating, marginalizing, discrediting or stigmatizing scholars. As noted earlier, scholars may be barred from facilities or events, their travel restricted, their interactions with colleagues chilled by surveillance and other harassments, they may be discharged arbitrarily, or expelled from their community or forced into exile, they may be
brought up on false charges, often alleging shameful or immoral conduct, or castigated in official media or local rumor networks. Often, these means of isolating scholars escalate in severity and danger. Beginning perhaps with friendly warnings about what would be good for one’s career, moving on to express directions to discontinue the disfavored activity, followed by physical threats against one’s self, family or friends. Over time, as threats escalate, the scholar’s isolation deepens leaving him alone and vulnerable. It is at this point that the scholar is at most risk of violence. Moreover, if it is not simply one scholar but many scholars in the same community who become isolated and cut off from each other in this way, entire campuses or academic systems can be threatened. We are nearing that point in some places today.

The good news is that with well planned, timely intervention this dynamic of isolation may be interrupted. And it is with that goal in mind that Scholars at Risk was founded.

IIE’s Scholar Rescue Fund

While in many cases Network-member institutions are able to identify all of the resources necessary to host a scholar’s visit, this is not always the case. In 2002 Scholars at Risk was fortunate to partner with the Institute of International Education (IIE) in the creation of IIE’s Scholar Rescue Fund. The Fund is a project of IIE, and awards matching-sum fellowships for threatened scholars from any discipline and any country, to support visits by these scholars to universities anywhere in the world. Scholars at Risk works with IIE both to identify suitable candidates and to arrange invitations for fellowship recipients to Network-member universities and colleges.

Applications for Scholar Rescue Fund fellowships are accepted from scholars directly or from third-parties acting on the scholar’s behalf, including nomination by an institution willing to host the scholar on campus. Competition for the fellowships is intense. Applications are evaluated first as to whether the candidate qualifies as a scholar, at least within the context of the home academic environment. Preference is given to applicants with a PhD or the most advanced degree in their field and at least four years of university or research experience. (Students and professionals generally do not qualify, although exceptions may be made for non-traditional scholars including public intellectuals, writers and artists.) Then the risk faced by each applicant is then considered. As noted above, it is not necessary to allege threats by government agents, or that the threats be specific to the content of the scholars work. However the more defined and specific the threats are the greater the likelihood of an award. (Scholars alleging purely financial hardships generally do not qualify.) Once any candidate passes these initial thresholds the application is compared with other pending cases. Strategic considerations may determine how limited awards are distributed among potentially qualified candidates. For example relative severities of risk are compared, the potential contribution of the scholar’s work is considered, and the efforts are made to distribute awards across geographic, discipline, gender, race or other boundaries.

What have we learned?

After four years and more than 550 cases, we have learned a lot. Most of the 50 or so candidates who found positions through the Network had no other options. Sadly there are far more out there that we did not help. So we must continue and expand our efforts.

This work is essential, but it is not easy. Our mandate could not be more broad: to serve scholars from any country and any discipline. Language barriers make it hard to identify some deserving candidates, and harder still to assist those we do identify. We are working on solutions. Several scholars have taken intensive English-language training at the beginning of their visits. In one case we arranged for a scholar to teach courses in her native language (Chinese). In others we arranged for an advanced graduate teaching assistant or arranged co-teaching assignments. Non-U.S. host universities are essential to addressing this challenge over the long term. Already, Scholars at Risk has help arrange visits to universities in France, Norway, Mexico, Australia, Nigeria and other countries. Over the next several years Scholars at Risk will actively seek new Network members outside the U.S., especially in countries where the language of instruction is not English.

Cultural barriers are also a challenge. Frequently new arrivals in the U.S. feel cut-off from the community or overwhelmed by the frenetic pace of the American university. Easy access to email and voicemail are new experiences. The related obsession with scheduling visits and even times to talk is confusing and off-putting. Academic cultures also differ greatly, where visiting scholars must adapt to students who expect more interactive teaching styles, greater in-class discussion and, frequently, fewer and shorter assignments. (One visiting scientist from Africa, for example, reported that his department chairman had to ask him to revise his grading scale upward because “American students expect to do better.”) None of these challenges are overwhelming nor are they necessary unique to Scholars at Risk candidates, but they are important. Scholars at Risk is currently drafting a “best practices” manual addresses these and other challenges. (We hope to circulate the manual to Network-members before the 2004-05 academic year, if adequate funds can be found for printing and postage.)

Other challenges are unique to the population of visiting scholars assisted by the Network, and more specifically by those who are selected in part because of the risk or danger they face at home. The recent increase in processing times for visa requests not only in the U.S. but in most countries for example might further jeopardize scholars fleeing urgent dangers if they cannot obtain a visa in a timely fashion. Other scholars who do manage to leave their home country may need assistance in changing visa status to permit them to accept offered invitations or to remain lawfully within a third-country while their case is reviewed and a host institution identified.

Financial challenges have also been common, although not insurmountable. Scholars who have endured years of harassment (often including legal fees, other expenses or loss of income) or made hasty departures from danger frequently do not have much, if any, savings. If they do it is frequently not available once they leave their home country or would be so devalued by conversion as to be almost meaningless. Stipends and salaries normally would not begin until after the scholar’s arrival. An advance against these is often required to cover travel expenses, or to assist the scholar on arrival, for example with the deposit on an apartment or to secure furnishings.
Sensitivity to the trauma of forced relocation and past experiences is also essential. While most scholars are able to resume their work relatively easily, some invariably will benefit from supportive encounters with other refugees, or even counseling professionals. Scholars may have personal security concerns, either for themselves upon their hoped-for return to their home country at the end of a visit or for family members or colleagues left behind. For this reason many scholars prefer not to be identified in Network media reports for fear of reprisals. (Others of course prefer to be identified in the hope that further international notoriety will add a measure of security upon their return.)

Many scholars will face a painful, personal decision concerning their long-term plans. Should they accept refugee status or to live with the uncertainty of exile, holding on to the faintest of hopes that change is coming at home, that one’s safe return will be possible soon, if not this year then next? Family issues obviously play a part in these questions. Even scholars who are single adults generally leave extended family behind. Married scholars frequently are forced to leave spouses and children, at least for an initial period while they reestablish themselves. Scholars at Risk has worked to arrange invitations for scholars with families. But limited resources require us to focus on the scholars themselves.

While neither the Scholars at Risk office nor any given host university should be expected to resolve all or even most these challenges, Scholars at Risk works with each scholar and each host-institution on a case-by-case basis to do whatever time and resources permit. Rather than shy away from these challenges, they provide the strongest evidence of the need for an organized effort like Scholars at Risk. While neither the Scholars at Risk office nor any given host university should be expected to resolve all or even most these challenges, Scholars at Risk works with each scholar and each host-institution on a case-by-case basis to do whatever time and resources permit. Rather than shy away from these challenges, they provide the strongest evidence of the need for an organized effort like Scholars at Risk that centralizes experience and can offer assistance and best practices to institutions and scholars alike.

What can you do to help?

The most important thing to do is to pay attention to attacks on scholars. Nearly every day major U.S. and international news media include reports on scholars somewhere facing harassment or threat. Read these stories, discuss them with colleagues, and when possible report them to Scholars at Risk. Anyone may nominate suitable candidates for assistance through the Network, or for a fellowship through the IIE Scholar Rescue Fund.

You may also urge your institution to become a member of the Network. Membership requires the institution to endorse a statement that academics should be free to do their work without fear of persecution, to designate an official liaison (or more than one) to be the point of contact with the Network office, and to receive through that liaison periodic reports on scholars seeking assistance. Network members are asked to review this information, to circulate it within the institution and, where possible, to consider inviting one of the scholars listed to campus for a temporary visit. Even if your institution does not anticipate hosting a scholar in the near term, just by receiving and reviewing occasional case information you help Scholars at Risk find hosts for candidates. This is because most placements result from personal contacts, word of mouth, and fortunate timing. The more institutions that receive and circulate the information, the more likely we are to find a match for a colleague in need.

Some campuses have even gone a step further, forming local Scholars at Risk committees to receive the candidate information and evaluate the cases. These committees have also scheduled lectures, panels or other public events through the Scholars at Risk Speaker Series as a means of educating their community to the importance of academic freedom. These events have great power. Not only do they help to raise awareness of problems in other countries, but when people -- especially students -- learn of the variety and breadth of obstacles placed in the way of learning communities elsewhere, then tend to appreciate more the opportunities they have on our campuses. They tend also to appreciate more the importance of academic freedom and open discourse, and become more engaged in its defense.

The future of Scholars at Risk

Scholars at Risk is working to build on our experience and to improve our services for scholars and member-institutions. With our recent relocation to New York University (from the University of Chicago) have hired a full-time program officer, established a Network-wide advisory committee and launched a speaker series featuring formerly threatened scholars.

Over the next few years we hope add training programs for scholars hosted by Network member institution, including arrival and adjustment training and job-searching skills training. We also look to increase research and advocacy capacity in the area of standards-building, monitoring and reporting of violations, and public education. At the same time, we are also actively seeking to grow the Network, inviting especially new members from outside the U.S., with a focus on French, Spanish and Russian language institutions.

The final and most serious challenge facing Scholars at Risk is lack of resources. We are currently seeking new sources of funding to support our efforts to assist scholars and universities. Without substantial new funding, our plans to expand and even to continue our efforts could be threatened.

Joseph Stalin said, "Ideas are more powerful than guns. We would not let our enemies have guns. Why should we let them have ideas?" As long as there remain those who share this thinking and seek to repress new ideas, there remains a need for Scholars at Risk and its Network member-institutions to oppose them.

Robert Quinn
Director, Scholars at Risk Network & the IIE Scholar Rescue Fund

3 For more information about the Scholar Rescue Fund visit http://www.iie.org/SRF or email SRF@iie.org.

Research Grants & Awards

Deutsche Stiftung Friedensforschung – DSF

In the first phase of a funding programme for 2002-2004, the Deutsche Stiftung Friedensforschung (DSF, German Foundation for Peace Research) has prioritized the topic "How to handle dangerous conflicts".

The three main areas for funding within this central topic are: 1. The dynamics of dangerous conflicts; 2. Involvement of third parties in dangerous conflicts – prevention, stopping escalation and de-escalation; and 3. Institutions and strategies for civilization of dangerous conflicts.

Besides funding projects within these main areas, where possible the DSF also supports other, particularly relevant projects. The following subject areas especially are given consideration: European peace order, democracy and peace, violence prevention and peace consolidation, disarmament and arms control, peace and economy, peace and ecology, peace and international law, and last but not least peace education. The aim is also to give gender specific issues and aspects of action research due consideration in all subject areas.

The maximum duration for a proposed research project is two years. Funding for this is limited to EUR 150,0000. Funding is available for a research project’s staffing, specialist materials and travel equipment, the materials for planning and running academic conferences and research colloquia, subsidies for printing costs and translation, and grants for accommodating visiting academics from abroad.

Applications to the Deutsche Stiftung Friedensforschung for project sponsorship should meet the following criteria, by indicating: the research status, schedule and methodology; whether the project is original; whether new results or knowledge are anticipated; why the application is being addressed to a peace research institution; who is being addressed by the results of the research; and how the results will be transferred into the public domain.
When evaluating applications, particular consideration will be given to aspects that address existing areas of deficiency in the structure of peace research. These include: the involvement and sponsorship of up-and-coming academics; collaboration between universities and other institutions; international, especially European, academic cooperation; reinforcement of peace research in countries and regions where it is under-represented; transfer of peace research results into the public domain and political practice; and the under-representation of women.

Each application should be submitted in writing in triplicate, along with an electronic version, to the DSF head office. The application will then be evaluated by two experts, and applicants will be informed immediately a decision has been made. There are two deadlines a year for applications: 15 June and 15 December. This does not include consideration will be given to aspects that address existing areas of deficiency in the structure of peace research. These include: the involvement and sponsorship of up-and-coming academics; collaboration between universities and other institutions; international, especially European, academic cooperation; reinforcement of peace research in countries and regions where it is under-represented; transfer of peace research results into the public domain and political practice; and the under-representation of women.

Each application should be submitted in writing in triplicate, along with an electronic version, to the DSF head office. The application will then be evaluated by two experts, and applicants will be informed immediately a decision has been made. There are two deadlines a year for applications: 15 June and 15 December. This does not include consideration will be given to aspects that address existing areas of deficiency in the structure of peace research. These include: the involvement and sponsorship of up-and-coming academics; collaboration between universities and other institutions; international, especially European, academic cooperation; reinforcement of peace research in countries and regions where it is under-represented; transfer of peace research results into the public domain and political practice; and the under-representation of women.

Contact: Deutsche Stiftung Friedensforschung (DSF), Am Ledenhof 3-5, 49074 Osnabrück, Germany, Tel.: +49-541-6003542, Fax: +49-541-60079039, email: info@bundesstiftung-friedensforschung.de, www.bundesstiftung-friedensforschung.de

L’institut de Recherches pour la paix à Genève (GIPRI)

The Geneva International Peace Research Institute was founded in the late 1970s by such personalities as Denis de Rougemont, Monique Bauer-Lagier (former government adviser), Max Petitpierre (former confederate adviser) and others. The institute was initially set up as an international association. In choosing the acronym GIPRI the founders were drawing on the good reputation of the Swedish Peace Research Institute in Stockholm - SIPRI.

GIPRI defines the prime duty of its pure research as bringing out the more deeply underlying causes of conflict, and not becoming involved in current peace research issues.

In 1984 the institute was transformed into an independent foundation under private Swiss law, dedicated to promoting research, teaching and interdisciplinary discussion. The transformation was initiated by the president of GIPRI at the time, Alexandre Bernstein (former Swiss federal judge). This new arrangement enabled the institute to address itself to the understanding and recognition of contexts as well as information and teaching. In 1988 this peace research institute was declared a “Peace Envoy” by the United Nations. GIPRI has its headquarters in the international city of Geneva. It is a non-governmental organization and since November 1996 has enjoyed special consultative status at the UN Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC).

The activities of the institute are unveiled to the outside world every year when a French-language summer course on Global Peace Issues is run with the support of UNIDIR (United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research) and the Free University of Brussels. This course is open to all researchers, students, international officials and any others committed to bringing about peace. Many prominent figures from the academic, international and diplomatic world are also freely invited to come and discuss crucial current issues in peace and conflict research. In an interview published on the homepage of the institute Jean-Pierre Stroop, then president of GIPRI, explains that the content of the summer courses is selected according to issues that seem to be most important at the time and that suggest they will be key for the immediate future and beyond. Every year the course programme is redesigned, as the choice of topics is very varied. In 2004 the summer course took as its subject “Les enjeux de la Paix au Proche Afrique”.

Peter van den Dungen, Friedensforschung und die Suche nach dem Frieden: Einige kritische Anmerkungen, September 1987, 20 S.

Elise Boulding, Friedenserziehung als Friedensbildung, November 1988, 18 S.

Elizabeth Richards, Friedenserziehung in der Diskussion, November 1989, 13 S.

Dieter Senghaas, Die moderne Entwicklungsproblematik und ihre Implikationen für Friedenspolitik, Januar 1991, 16 S.

Thomas Dominikowski, Frieden lehren?! Über Friedenslehre und Curricula der Friedenswissenschaft an Hochschulen, Februar 1991, 36 S.

Tordis Batscheider, Friedensforschung und Geschlechterverhältnis: Selbstreflexive Betrachtungen zum erweiterten Gewaltbegriff, April 1993, 20 S.

Lothar Brock, Friedensforschung im Zeichen immer neuer Kriege, Oktober 1994, 13 S.


Birgit Brock-Utne, Multikulturelle Erziehung und Entwicklung: Gemeinsamkeiten und Herausforderungen für die Friedenspädagogik, März 1999, 18 S.

Arne C. Seifert, Wider die neuen Kriege! Probleme einer Transformationsgesellschaft am Beispiel Tadschikistans, März 1999, 28 S.

Sabine Jaberg, Der Gewaltbegriff als generierender und differenzie render Faktor der Friedensforschung, September 1999, 44 S.


Jörg Becker, Beitrag der Medien zur Krisenprävention und Konfliktbearbeitung, Januar 2003, 34 S.

Ruth Seifert, Plädiert für eine Subjekt- und Genderperspektive in der Friedens- und Konfliktforschung, Januar 2003, 18 S.

Authors’ names printed in bold: these publications can be printed in pdf format from our web site. The series was discontinued at the end of 2003.
et Moyen – Orient" (Peace initiatives in the Near and Middle East).

Besides the summer courses – the next one is scheduled for the last two weeks of August and the first week in September 2005 –, which are also suitable for graduate students studying for a doctorate and exam candidates, GIPRI runs interdisciplinary conferences on topics in peace studies that are under dispute. In Spring 2005 the next conference will address the issue “Water for Peace, l’eau dans le conflit Israël-Palestinienn” (Water for Peace, water in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict).

A further key concern of the Geneva International Peace Research Institute lies in the dissemination of information about its work. On the one hand the web site gives information about GIPRI's current projects. On the other, a bulletin for the general public is published three times a year. GIPRI publishes a series of Cahiers twice a year containing details of research projects. Forthcoming publications in the Cahiers series are concerned with the following subjects:

- Le système national-mondial hiérarchisé en 2004 by Michel Baubl
- L’éthnisme: Cause ou légitimation de nouveaux conflits? by Laurent Calligé and Laia Serradell (forthcoming 2006)

Contact: Fondation GIPRI, La Voie Creuse 16, 1202 Geneva, Switzerland, Tel.: +41-22-9197942, Fax: +41-22-9197943, email: gipri@gcsp.ch, www.gipri.ch

Zentrum für Europäische Friedens- und Sicherheitsstudien – ZEUS

The Zentrum für Europäische Friedens- und Sicherheitsstudien (Centre for European Peace Studies) is a branch of the Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy at the University of Hamburg (IFSH). In setting up ZEUS, the IFSH was implementing the recommendation made by the Academic Council in 2001 that it develop a research profile focusing on European security policy.

The Centre is backed up by the many years’ experience of the IFSH in the field of conceptual, functional, structural and operative formulation of European security policy. The Centre’s research programme focuses on the contribution of the European Union towards reinforcing peace and security in the fields of action of the Common Foreign and Security Policy and the European Security and Defence Policy (CFSP/ESDP) within and beyond EU borders. This is embedded in the IFSH’s research programme, “The Civilization of Conflict”, within the framework of which the possibilities for civil crisis prevention and non-violent conflict management in particular are under scrutiny.

The formation of ZEUS broadened the opportunities already present at the IFSH in this field within the framework of OSCE research by analyzing European Union policy and its outline conditions. The Centre works specifically on shared and coordinated research with the Centre for OSCE Research (CORE) and the Interdisciplinary Research Group on Arms Control, Disarmament and Risk Technologies (IFAR). The cooperation with CORE involved inter alia research on democratization and transformation, along with setting up institutions under the rule of law in South and East Europe and Central Asia, and the cooperation with IFAR involves research into arms control and disarmament, and international terrorism, its causes, dangers and consequences.

The Centre’s long-term research orientation considers the most important peace and security policy corner points in the evolution of the European Union, as follows:

- Self-image and the role of the European Union as peace power;
- Development and reinforcement of EU structures relevant to peace and security policy;
- Expansion of the EU and the challenges and opportunities that arise from it, especially for inter-institutional cooperation with the OSCE to create a stable security system with the prospect of a lasting peace order in Europe;
- Building up the Euro-Atlantic relationship paying particular attention to security policy relations between the EU and the USA or between the EU and NATO;
- EU action as a global player in peace and security policy specializing in those areas of regional cooperation which are of particular importance to the IFSH’s patron, the Free Hanseatic City of Hamburg.

At ZEUS, studies being worked on cover the fields of activity of the CFSP/ESDP and European Police and Judicial Cooperation, as well as the evolution of the EU as upholder, mediator and implementor of civil crisis prevention and non-violent conflict management. The research results are made available to academics, political advisers and the public.

The findings of the research are to be used for academic teaching straight away (especially for the MPS, Master of Peace Research and Security Politics, run by the IFSH in collaboration with other institutions), and likewise for the care and support of up-and-coming academics at the IFSH. The Centre supports dissertations, Master’s and PhD theses which conform to its research profile and which are suited towards reinforcing this profile.

A particular emphasis of the Centre’s research occupies the interface between civil prevention of violence and the role played by armed forces in peace and security politics. This emphasis is in keeping with the long held tradition of the IFSH, established in particular by its first director, Generalleutnant a.D. Wolf Graf Baudissin. Research on the democratization of armed forces and on national leadership, which not only is increasing in political significance for future defence policy cooperation at European level, but is also of importance for EU security policy overall, is linked with the Centre in close collaboration with the military section of IFSH.

ZEUS produces comprehensive, soundly based academic services and transfers in its own sphere of competence and across different fields for the Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy at the University of Hamburg. Services and transfers include amongst other things: internet-based data; publication and editing of academic publications; peace education; public relations work; and the organization of academic teaching.

All academic employees at ZEUS are responsible for students in the context of academic teaching, especially on the MPS post-graduate course. Qualifications and opportunities permitting, up-and-coming academics are also involved in teaching and mentoring work.

Contact: Institut für Friedensforschung und Sicherheitspolitik an der Universität Hamburg (IFSH), Zentrum für Europäische Friedens- und Sicherheitsstudien (ZEUS), Falkensteingarten 1, 22587 Hamburg, Germany, Tel.: +49-40-8660770, Fax: +49-40-8663615, email: Ehhardt@public.uni-hamburg.de, www.ifsh.de/zeus/index.htm

Conference Reports

“The Strongest Man is Strongest when Alone - The USA as World Power”

Conference from 4-6 June 2004 at the Evangelische Akademie Loccum in collaboration with the John Hopkins University (Washington).

The Evangelische Akademie Loccum, in collaboration with the Johns Hopkins University (Washington), hosted the conference entitled “The Strongest Man is Strongest when Alone – The USA as World Power”. The objective of this international conference attended by delegates from academia, politics and journalism was to analyse the various ambitions, concepts and options of American foreign and security policy with particular reference to the conflict in the Middle East. In addition, the outline, challenges and limitations on political power of the USA, the
only remaining world power, were examined and the transatlantic relationship redefined. Consequently, multilateralism and the issue of the role of Europe in a unipolar world formed a central theme throughout the conference.

On the whole, however, the international situation and the USA’s foreign policy were not examined so much from the perspective of peace studies. The American, especially, but also one or two European speakers, demonstrated a preference for politics dictated by national interests. This resulted from time to time in a lack of “broader visions”, ideas for greater international justice and a fundamentally idealistic outlook on world politics. Nonetheless one advantage of this conference was that conference delegates were now and again given an authentic glimpse into the political trains of thought of speakers close to government.

Guiding principles, resources and potential of the USA as world power

The opening papers of the conference were mainly concerned with the guiding principles, resources and potential upon which American power is based. In his introductory paper Professor Hacke from the University of Bonn retraced the USA’s path to sole global and organizational power in the 20th century, placing special emphasis on the ambivalence of American foreign policy. Ambivalence was particularly apparent in foreign policy structures, described as either “congressional” or “presidential” government – depending on whether Congress or the President was dominant. Hacke found that the way that the USA sees itself, as having the role of setting an example of civilization, is now based on military resources and geopolitical interests, as a result of the change of paradigms since 9/11.

The division of US foreign policy put forward by the speaker before him was found wanting by Professor Wiarda of the Center for Strategic & International Studies (CSIS) in Washington. He cited additional factors, such as think tanks, political parties, rivalries within the parliamentary system, interest groups, political culture and public opinion, as decisive in US foreign and security policy. Wiarda presented differing procedural models for American foreign policy: besides the rational procedural model (the careful weighing up of the pros and cons of a specific policy based on expert opinion), the bureaucratic procedural model was also of considerable importance, as a political decision frequently depended on the government’s internal division of power. If foreign policy was generated by rivalry between different political institutions, on the whole it was not always the most rational concept politically that won the day. US foreign policy should therefore be seen as a complex network of political protagonists and shifting coalitions, competing for budget and influence, plus internal political arguments.

In the panel discussion Professor Gärtner of the Austrian Institute for International Politics in Vienna and Professor Rhodes of the George C. Marshall Center for Security Studies in Garmisch spoke further on the resources and potential of the USA. Rhodes concentrated on describing the excellent resources for power politics possessed by the USA as world power. In addition to high quality technology and substantial financial provision, Rhodes emphasized the morality and high standard of education of American troops in comparison to the rest of the world.

Unlike Rhodes, Gärtner went beyond military aspects with regard to American resources, referring to the multipolar division of power in economic issues and the importance of transnational protagonists. Soft power, such as the American export of democracy and human rights, was crucial, and a decline in American soft power would be anything but welcome. Gärtner was also sceptical about the comprehensive military reform of 2002. Along with the development of mini-nuclear weapons (Nuclear Posture Review) this might be reduced to the threshold of a war as a security policy concept.

With regard to the American preemptive strategy, Gärtner pointed out that the new European security doctrine also provides for preemptive measures. Preemptive measures did not therefore merit condemnation in principle. Instead, there should be a discussion about them, concerning whether and in what way it might be possible to formulate generally binding rules.

World Power USA’s collaborations and commitments

The discussion round entitled “How does the USA collaborate and what are its commitments?” also explored the topic of generally binding rules. Professor Garret of the University of Leipzig, Prof. Hummel (University of Düsseldorf), Piotr Ogorzilski from the Polish Foreign Ministry, and former president of the Association of UN Corre-
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Ian Williams denounced the USA’s one-sided power politics and hegemonial foreign policy, which was trying not so much to establish its own legitimacy as to build up a new enemy image in the form of Islamic terrorism and in so doing increasingly contradicting its own interests. Diplomacy seemed increasingly to be perceived as a weakness on the part of imperial power, although the Iraq War itself had illustrated that the USA was running up against its own limitations and was dependent upon assistance from the international community. For this reason, and because of the weak dollar and huge budgetary deficit, Williams predicted the end of the empire.

This hypothesis envisaging the end of American supremacy did not win favour with many listeners. The American contingent pointed out that the Iraq War could certainly be described as “multilateral” because of the “Coalition of the Willing”, which also included European countries. Not everyone was convinced by this argument, in view of the number of “banana republics” within the coalition. Furthermore, the question arose whether Europe or individual European countries might not have taken similar unilateral action, if they had had the same resources at their disposal as the USA. At this point the German delegates insisted on pointing out the achievement within Europe of a cooperative, compromise-oriented behaviour pattern adopted by a community of states.

Promotion of stability, security and peace as a task for the USA as world power

A further panel discussion explored the issue of what the USA should do to promote security, stability and peace. The panel included, besides Walter Andrusyszyn, until recently a member of the National Security Council in Washington, Professor Hyde-Price from the University of Leicester, international journalist Andreas Zumach and Generalleutnant Dr. Olshausen.

Olshausen stressed the importance of alliances such as NATO and pointed out that security issues, and the importance of conflict prevention and military intervention could only be discussed in detail in a serious transatlantic dialogue.

In contrast to this, Andrusyszyn referred almost exclusively to hard power as the tool of foreign policy. He spoke of the strike capacity and equipment of the military, but also of financial power. The urgency of the objective would decide the kind of Hard Power to be used. The USA was not able to solve all global problems by itself, however the United States would continue not to hesitate to seize the offensive if its national interests were affected. Andrusyszyn believed that Europe should turn down the volume of its criticism of the USA. Instead, Europe should make concrete proposals e.g. for the conflict in the Middle East, and shoulder more responsibility in world crises. For alongside the situation in the Balkans and the Caucasus, potential energy supply problems ought to appear as more of a priority on the political agenda in future. The United States of America for its part was aware of its historical responsibility for global problems and would install democracy in the Middle East in line with its strategic vision as it once did in Germany and Japan.

Unlike Andrusyszyn’s power politics paradigm, Zumach emphasized the importance of soft power. Combating hunger, AIDS and threats to the environment should not be viewed as tasks of secondary importance in foreign and security policy. Zumach also emphasized that multilateralism as a concept in international politics was one of the most important outcomes of the history of the last 100 years.

Hyde–Price combined these opposing viewpoints on the importance of soft and hard power into a concept for foreign policy action. The USA should find a balanced relationship between soft and hard power, and aim towards a partnership with Europe with equal rights, despite its role as the power which brings order. However it was indispensable that the USA become involved globally and in a military capacity, as soft power alone was not enough to meet the challenges. Without the intervention of the USA the future of crisis regions would be impossible to predict. Military intervention was necessary and a credible threat of coercion often unavoidable. Hyde–Price also urged that for different regions with their specific problems proposed solutions would have to be worked through case by case and any mere fight against terrorism prevented.
Opportunities and requirements of the USA world power in the Middle East

American policy in crisis regions was subsequently examined in more detail in the panel discussion on “Requirements of the USA world power in the Middle East”. The Director of the Deutsches Oriente-Insitut (German Institute for Middle East Studies), Professor Steinbach, took the floor. Steinbach proved to be a vehement critic of US world power policy and of the course set by the Bush administration in particular. He insinuated that those in positions of power in Washington were pursuing a “trial and error” style of politics, and Steinbach even described the American reaction to terrorism as the greatest failure since the Second World War, as it had simply provoked a lasting conflict. In this way the unpredictability of the Middle East region had increased further and anti-American ideology had taken on a quality that it had never had before. It would be a more sensible idea, instead of unilateral power politics, to promote reform processes within Arab countries and work towards a repetition of the CSCE process. In order to do this, the USA would have to return to the multilateralism of the UN system.

Common Agenda for the USA world power and Europe?

The final panel discussion once more addressed the issue of a common agenda for Europe and the USA. Speakers included Dr Janes from the Johns Hopkins University in Washington and the Italian journalist Dr Politi, Professor Segbers from the FU Berlin, Karsten Voigt (SPD), Coordinator for German-American Cooperation in the German Foreign Office, and Dr Pflüger, Chairman of the German Federal Expert Committee on CDU Foreign and Security policy.

In his paper, Janes stressed that American interest groups and the general public expected strong leadership and active reactions from the president in the face of global threats. From the American point of view the “Coalition of the Willing” was the foreign policy concept of the future. Even if there were no consensus over the means to be used, the concrete threat should nonetheless be taken seriously in Europe and the opportunities to which it gave rise used. Janes also warned that the Germans should not pin their hopes on a change of course by the Democratic candidate for the American presidency John Kerry, as American policy “is and will be driven by the facts”.

Politi took a cynical turn of phrase, speaking of the epidemic of opportunism that had gobbled up political brains, with the result that transatlantic relations would merely be overtaken by the fate of a long, drawn-out death or a fundamental volte-face. People should ask themselves where the line was drawn between Europe and America, and where it ought to be drawn. Instead of living with a fairy story, which was destroying their friendship, the EU and the USA ought to conclude a new security agreement in keeping with the times. With regard to American interventions, he pointed out that the myth of the Americans as liberators was a thing of the past.

Segbers also criticized the USA with regard to their hegemonial actions and put the case for a re-evaluation of European-American relations. He acknowledged two prerequisites for global acceptance of a hegemony, neither of which had been met by the USA: the hegemony could be described as neither benevolent nor rational, as US politics were too short-term and selfish. For this reason US supremacy was not acceptable to Europeans and the efforts should be made towards building a more equal relationship.

Voigt found that in spite of the constellation over the terrorist attacks it was important to act rationally. He was concerned that the USA, because of this constellation, was limiting its options for action to an either-or, and in so doing cutting out civilian options for crisis management, for example.

With regard to transatlantic relations, it was now critical how Germany and the USA would in future deal with the change in relevance and dependency. According to Voigt the American government would have to make itself more open to criticism from abroad and at home, and also to the problems of other countries. Even in the case of converging, but not coinciding, common European-American interests, it should be possible for Europe to bring about stabilization if necessary even without the USA. This required a strong Europe. Nonetheless cooperation with the USA would continue to be a pillar of German and European foreign and security policy in the future.

Pflüger found that in the year of the Iraq War Europe had not been capable of dialogue and had been perceived as powerless in the Arab world. In Pflüger’s opinion, besides implementing the Broader Middle East Initiative, it was particularly important to make a clear distinction between Islam and Islamists, to deal more sensitively with human rights and democracy, and social assistance along the lines of a Marshall Plan for the rapidly growing Arab nations. It was important to have an exchange at the level of civil society with the Middle East and concentrate from the perspective of cultural politics on this region. Pflüger attempted to forge links between the American and European positions, by making the point that according to the Solana Paper the positions of Europe and the USA were not so entirely different at all.

Conference findings and evaluation: “Nothing ventured, nothing gained?”

In the final analysis, there was a fundamental consensus among all participants that transatlantic relations had been substantially disrupted. The set of shared interests built up between Europe and the USA during the Cold War had disappeared, and the problem now lay in the fact that a modified allied partnership might not automatically follow on from this. Opinion was unanimous that the Iraq War had merely laid bare the differences between the USA and Europe, and that these seemed less to do with the situation and more to do with structure.

The conceptual differences between American, Continental European and British speakers, whose clashes helped make the plenary session into a varied exchange of opinion, were therefore plain. However, difficulties arose from the fact that some positions held by various representatives seemed entrenched. Thus the American speakers, especially security experts Professor Wiarda, Dr Janes and Walter Andrussyszyn, who were close to the government, came across in their assessment of the USA's status as world power as not only staunch supporters of the realist school and of hard power, but at the same time as advocates of a resolute, unilateral leadership role for the USA to pursue its own national interests. In contrast, German or Continental European speakers such as Professor Steinbach saw themselves as tending to be representatives of a power for peace, of soft power and multilateralism and at the same time as a European world conscience. Professor Hyde-Price occupied the intermediary position between the strong Anglo-Saxon axis on the one hand and the emphasis on soft power elements and multilateralism as concepts for Continental European foreign policy on the other.

The message issued from this controversial conference appears to be that in spite of existing American-European differences there should be made of common opportunities. An essential prerequisite for global security is that the USA and the EU stand by each other. Generalleutnant Olshausen put the case in favour of a strategic dialogue with the USA, in which the EU should present its own proposals and regional strategies in a confident and if possible united manner, so as to be able to help shape world politics. As representative of the German federal government, Voigt stressed that the influence of a European partner on the USA’s decisions of general principle was important. It was not only a matter of legitimizing American politics, but also of the influence of Europe and the establishment of a system of checks and balances in a community and strategic partnership of nations. Journalist Ian Williams called upon Europe not only to take up a united position against the USA, but also to take opposing action, without being dislo-
al. According to Williams multilateralism in the international system also requires a little multipolarity.

So, is the strong man strongest when alone? Or does the strongest man need a strong ally? One thing is clear: Europe could and should be prepared to take more leaps in foreign policy, while the USA should take a closer look before it does. However, is this an adequate formula for achieving international security, stability and peace? It just had to be an American president who made a conciliatory observation on this point: “There is no single, simple key to this peace, no grand or magic formula to be adopted by one or two powers. Genuine peace must be the product of many nations, the sum of many acts.” (John F. Kennedy)

Dominic Raphael Schwickert
(University of Münster)

Security policy: present and future of transatlantic relations and strategies for Europe

Schlaining Summer Academy from 4-10 July 2004 at Burg Schlaining, Austrian Study Center for Peace and Conflict Resolution

From 4 to 10 July 2004 just under 250 delegates gathered in the south of Austria’s Burgenland province to discuss the “labour pains of an emancipated Europe and its relations to a solitary superpower” under the main heading “The Rebirth of Europe”. In the wake of the Iraq War and the impression this made, Jürgen Habermas and Jacques Derrida had elaborated a much discussed paper entitled “Our renewal. After the war: the rebirth of Europe”. In this paper the philosophers found that because of the worldwide protests on 15/02/2003 there appeared to be a European public being born. The debate on war policy under George W. Bush, the effects on transatlantic relations and strategies for Europe left its mark on the 21st Schlaining Summer Academy, opened as tradition dictated by the president of the Austrian Study Center for Peace and Conflict Resolution (ÖSFK), Gerald Mader.

Emancipation from which spirit?

Main speaker Ekkehart Krippendorff (Freie Universität Berlin) elaborated upon mythological connections in the search for the spirit of Europe’s rebirth. Krippendorff took the view that Europe was a product of the spirit rather than of wars of conquest, even if these perhaps formed its foundation. It appeared as if cultural self-awareness had initially been based on peace, until Greek historian Thucydides pushed the motives of power politics into the limelight in his work Peloponnesian Wars. The sharpest criticism of the EU constitution is currently the fact that for the first time military armament should be covered by the constitution. The public, evidently not outraged, but informed and educated in a long history of Realpolitik thinking, is in Krippendorff’s opinion actually somewhat proud to be able to look the putative facts of the politics rationally in the face in Thucydidean style. They have no criteria for forming an opinion beyond the “competence at power management” category, he believes. If a new Europe therefore seeks to return to a point at which it can take up its own non-violent tradition, it must be reborn as a cultural Europe.

Emancipation of Europe and the “solitary superpower”

With Thomas Roithner (ÖSFK) as moderator, Dolores Bauer1 (freelance journalist) put the question as to the origin of what we now call Europe. The first cultivated plants, cultivation techniques and the plough had their origins in the advanced civilization which was now being bombed to smithereens as a “rogue state” (Iraq) or which was in the sights of US foreign policy (Syria). It was also the “highly developed Europeans” who had taken the lives of 6 million people in the Second World War. Nowadays they were getting themselves worked up about the ethnic cleansing in Rwanda and being filled with moral indignation, although millions of people die every year while everybody more or less turns a blind eye. Only when equality of the sexes had been achieved, and an active civilian society was participating in political events and the shaping of a better future, would it be possible to associate a positive connotation with the concept of Europe once more. The population would then also be able to develop a feeling of identification, which would make it possible to convert their own impressions of peace.

In his paper entitled “On the way to a new world order: American responses and European attempted responses”, Olfried Nassauer2 (Berlin Information-center for Transatlantic Security, BITS) describes the relation of the militarized EU to the USA and also the uniform EU security policy. The creation of an EU security strategy (Javier Solana) was also orientated towards the military end of security policy preferred by the USA. EU risk analysis – terrorism, weapons of mass destruction, failed states – increasingly followed the tone of Washington. There was no conception for the preconditions, objective and nature of EU military interventions. Nassauer detected an undermining of international relations on the part of the US administration. This manifests itself as stripping of rights (ABM Treaty, International Criminal Court), a renationalizing of international relations (from the UN to the USA), the devaluation of international organizations (NATO, the UN) through “coalitions of the willing”, and an expansion of “legitimate” grounds for intervention and circumstances of war (prevention and preemption). Nassauer perceived the EU’s strengths as lying in the civilian domain – social, political, economic and societal interventions. So that these strengths could be displayed, Europe must get involved in crises promptly, designate future risks and propose ways towards conflict resolution. Europe’s transfer achievements in development politics are in Nassauer’s view without a doubt contributions towards security. This notwithstanding, Europe should also have at its disposal credible military resources as a “last resort”.

EU constitution and security strategy

With Wolfgang Machreich (Die Furche) as moderator, Werner Ruf3 – peace researcher at the University of Kassel – spoke on the subject of “The finality of Europe – the end of the dream of civil power?” Ruf criticized militarization as constitutional objective (compulsory armament, global interventionism, armament organization, “coalitions of the willing” in the EU). The EU is standing on the UN Charter on its head: it is not the EU, but the UN Security Council alone that has to decide upon military involvement in crises. “The subordination of European forces under the command of the United Nations” would be a measure for supporting international law, Ruf commented during a press interview he gave on the fringes of the academy. Ruf is baffled by the fact that Schröder and Chirac – both supporters of neoliberal deregulation – are now suddenly reaching for state control mechanisms in the creation of an EU arms industry. Among other things the conflicts between the USA and part of “the core of Europe” during the course of the Iraq War owe something to this circumstance. In contrast to the majority of political and military elites Ruf takes a sceptical view of the use of force, as the credibility of a policy of civilian power requires doing without the military.

Corinna Hauswedell4 (Bonn International Center for Conversion, BICC) spoke on “The development of European security policy in the light of the constitution and EU security doctrine”. In analyzing risk scenarios in EU security strategy the peace researcher finds strong correspondences between the European and US-American approach. The security concept on paper was only inadequately defined. Furthermore she criticized the fact that the selection of ways of managing crises and conflict situations ultimately concentrated strongly on military means, although the use of civilian means was upheld. In addition, in neither the EU strategy paper nor the proposed constitution were interventions without a UN mandate excluded and there was no space for disarmament in the Solana strategy. Hauswedell looked for the development of an independent European security policy, uninfluenced by the USA, which was not geared towards establishing the EU as a second global police force.
Transatlantic dispute over global supremacy

In his personal view, Jürgen Rose (Oberleutnant in the German Army) argued that it lay in Europe’s existential interest to develop a sturdy alternative security policy against this form of politics run amok. NATO was nowadays a political body for legitimizing global wars instigated by those in a position of supremacy. On EU military ambitions Rose’s comment was: “The ideal way to independence could in no way consist of the EU for its part striving towards the status and power of a global military power, but rather in the clever use of diplomacy and economic strength. Use of violence by the EU should only result on the basis of a decision by the UN Security Council or the OSCE, or within the framework of self-defence. With regard to terrorism, Rose suggested that the EU maintain its distance from neo-conservative “crazies”, so as not to fall into the sights of terrorists. The public would seem well advised to take a constantly critical, almost mistrustful, view of EU security policy.

With Veronika Gasser (Wiener Zeitung) as moderator Claudia Haydt (Informationsstelle Militarisierung) set out her thoughts on “Cooperative security and/or global hegemony?” Haydt explained that it was a work of fiction to talk of a Europe as civil power. The proposed EU constitution and security strategy themselves showed that there is no civilian concept. She referred to Robert Cooper, right-hand man to Javier Solana, who believes that everybody who talks of Germany or Europe as a civil power is labouring under an illusion. The driving forces for the militarization of the EU are Germany and France, and the Iraq War has done nothing to diminish efforts to build up EU battle groups and the 60,000 man strong intervention force. With regard to transatlantic relations Haydt said that the EU should be a counterbalance to the USA, not a copy. In spite of many common interests Haydt sees in trade and arms policies an increasing number of competitive situations, arising from the competition between the US dollar and the euro. The peace researcher from Tübingen predicted for security policy that without taking back large sections of EU militarization a conflict between the USA and the EU was inevitable.

Structures against military globalization

With Cornelia Krebs (ORF) as moderator Sepp Wall-Strasser (ÖGB and ATTAC) put forward his views on the critical movement against globalization and the trade unions taking action against the abolition of welfare and militarization for discussion. It was apparent that international politics were developing such that war was once again becoming a political tool. In the abolition of social rights Wall-Strasser perceived a danger for world peace. The radical market economy and unadulterated capitalism were a new form of totalitarian thinking. Modification of economic policy is also an important issue for security policy. Wall-Strasser proposed democratic controls of the financial markets and a just system of redistribution.

David Krieger of the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation (Santa Barbara) reported on the US peace movement in the time of the war against terror declared by the Bush government. Krieger concentrated mainly on the issue of nuclear disarmament. He picked out as a central theme the Non Proliferation Treaty (NPT), the Nuclear Posture Review, the national US security strategy, the issue of mini nuclear weapons and US expenditure of US$ 6.6 billion in the year 2005. The documents above also include the US threat towards states that have no nuclear weapons at their disposal. Krieger stressed the opportunities for state and civil society to take action against nuclear weapons. He referred to the Middle Powers Initiative (MPI) and the 150 NGOs, which support a group of countries within the framework of the UN for nuclear disarmament – along with the Mayors for Peace, a citizens’ initiative against nuclear weapons.

Future of multilateralism

Hans-Joachim Heintze (University of Bochum) spoke on the challenges facing the UN in times of “permanent war”. Heintze emphasized the importance of multilateralism in the face of the USA’s unilateral action. The global challenges are too complex to be resolved unilaterally. The specialist in international law from Bochum noted that the size of the UN and the vastly differing interests of the member states were making it difficult to pass resolutions. The Security Council with its five permanent members (China, France, GB, Russia, USA) is responsible for international peace issues. The world of states was preoccupied with the right to veto and the reform of this body even before 1989. The fact of its being subject to the Security Council – or taking part in unanimity – means loss of national sovereignty for the USA. This affects the NBC weapon disarmament programme, the ABM Treaty, the International Criminal Court, the ban on war of aggression, among other things. The Iraq example illustrates on a daily basis that unilateral action brings little success. The solution would be for the USA to rejoin the international community.

Norman Paech (University of Hamburg) spoke on “The rebirth of NATO – From defense to world order”. His hypothesis was that the model for new world order appeared as follows: without the UN, but with NATO and the USA. The specialist in international law from Hamburg worked his way through those NATO deployment scenarios which no longer had anything to do with Article 5 – collective defence of the alliance: “objective of NATO strategy and of self-authorization to intervene are ethnic and religious rivalries, territorial disputes, inadequate or failed efforts to reform.” Paech added “acts of terrorism, sabotage and organized crime, as well as interruption of the supply of vital resources, and the uncontrolled movement of large numbers of people” as grounds for NATO interventions. By 1999 at the latest, NATO had evolved away from the UN Charter and Article 5 towards being a globally operating instrument for intervening in crises and safeguarding resources. Paech observed that NATO’s relation to the EU intervention force was “complementary”. He now saw it as the peace movement’s task to “civilize” NATO, rather than abolish it.

Security Policy for Europe

In his closing paper, with Gudrun Harrer (Der Standard) as moderator, Ernst-Otto Czempiel (Hessische Stiftung Friedens- und Konfliktforschung, HSFK) stressed that the EU was a regionalized state in the making, which had as its main emphasis the integration and pacification. The USA opposed the emancipation of the EU. Czempiel added: “During the course of history nothing has caused more wars than the attempt by one state (...) to diminish the position of power of another state or of another group of states. This used at one time to be called hegemonial war.” Although the peace researcher from Frankfurt was making no assumptions that there would be a war in the Atlantic relationship, he nonetheless feared a dispute that would stretch the boundaries of endurance, as the USA would defend its power. Czempiel proposed that the EU should be a partner to the USA with equal rights and cooperating based on the division of labour, rather than a counterbalance. The decisions on this matter should however be made in Europe. One of the EU security strategies would be a commitment against poverty. The EU spends some US$ 160 billion on armaments every year. In contrast, Kofi Annan would need US$ 50 billion to eliminate poverty.

Time travel through the historiography of peace

Under the heading “Unheard calls for peace and why they remained unheard”, Karlheinz Koppe – former President of IPRA – took participants in the academy on a journey through time across the historiography of peace. Historiography in our school books was communicated primarily as following on from rulership conflicts and wars. Periods of peace, of crucial importance for the evolution of civilizations, were glossed over as a rule. Koppe gave an introduction into the world of pacifist thinkers, referring to Hammurabi of Babylon, Siddhartha Gautama (the Buddha), Heraclitus, Plato, Francis of Assisi, Erasmus of Rotterdam, Immanuel Kant, Bertha von Suttner, Mahatma Gandhi etc. During the afternoons, 8 workshops with the main focus on media and war were run in
parallel. Morning lectures were supplemented by work groups on conflict transformation and pacifism. Other events during the summer academy were a debate on anti-Americanism, a barbecue and film evening, a religious service for peace and a party at the castle.

The book on the academy was published in autumn 2004 and can be ordered online at: aspr.vie@aspr.ac. The 22nd Summer Academy will take place 15–20 July 2005 and will be opened by Federal President Dr. Heinz Fischer.

Dr. Thomas Roithner
On the academic staff at the Österreichisches Studienzentrum für Frieden und Konfliktlösung Burgh Schlaining (Vienna branch)

1Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, 31/05/2003.
4http://www.bits.de
7Christoph Weller, Ulrich Ratsch, Reinhard Mutz, Bruno Schoch, Corinna Hausweddell (Hg.): Friedensgutachten, Münster 2004.
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12http://www.pcf.city.hiroshima.jp/mayors/english/
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International: “Human Security – Conflict, Critique and Consensus”

The September edition of the Security Dialogue journal contains a special section focusing on the question “What is Human Security?” All the academic papers from a colloquium aiming to summarize the bewildering variety of literature on this subject are gathered together in this volume. The result is a microcosm of the ten-year academic debate on the nature of human security within the issues surrounding security policy. After an introduction by the editor on the various opinions and definitions of human security, the three fundamental characteristics of the concept of human security are set out in brief sections by 21 international academics. First the theoretical debates are covered, then the opportunities for practical application of human security and finally criticism and defence of the concepts. In the process of this it becomes clear how multifaceted and undefined the topic is and how much research and discussion is still necessary to obtain an overall valid and thus theoretically and methodically verifiable basis for the concept of human security.

Authors and their contributions on the main heading “What is Human Security?”: Ramesh Thakur (United Nations University, Tokyo): A Political Worldview; Lloyd Axworthy (University of Winnipeg, Manitoba): A New Scientific Field and Policy Lens; Finn Olsner Hampson (Norman Peterson School of International Affairs, Carleton University, Ottawa): A Concept in Need of a Global Policy Response; Don Hubert (Canadian Department of Foreign Affairs): An Idea that Works in Practice; Peter Uvin (The Fletcher Scholl, Tufts University, Medford, MA): A Field of Overlaps and Interactions; Caroline Thomas (University of Southampton): A Bridge Between the Interconnected Challenges Confronting the World; Jennifer Leaning (Harvard University): Psychological Well-Being over Time; Amitav Acharya (Institute of Defense and Strategic Studies, Singapore): A Holistic Paradigm; Kyle Grayson (York University, Toronto): A Challenge to the Power over Knowledge of Traditional Security Studies; Edward Newman (United Nations University, Tokyo): A Normatively Attractive but Analytically Weak Concept; Sabina Alkire (Harvard University): A Vital Core that Must Be Treated with the Same Gravitas as Traditional Security Threats; Kanti Bajpai (The Doon School, India): An Expression of Threats Versus Capabilities Across Time and Space; Donna Winslow & Thomas Hylland Eriksen (University of British Columbia, Canada): A Concept Still on the Margins, but Evolving from Its Asian Roots; Astri Suhrke (Chr. Michelsen Institute, Norway): A Stalled Initiative; Andrew Mack (University of British Columbia, Canada): A Signifier of Shared Values; Keith Krause (Graduate Institute for International Studies, Geneva): The Key to a Powerful Agenda, if Properly Delimited; S. Neil Macfarlane (Oxford University): A Useful Concept that Risks Losing Its Political Salience; Barry Buzan (London School of Economics and Political Science): A Reductionist, Idealistic Notion that Adds Little Analytical Value; Roland Paris (University of Colorado at Boulder): Still an Instructable Concept.

The colloquium concluded with a summary and closing speech by Taylor Owen (International Peace Research Institute Oslo, Norway).

Contact: The Editor, Security Dialogue, International Peace Research Institute, Oslo (PRIO), Fuglehauggata 11, NO-0260 Oslo, Norway, Tel.: +47-22-547700, Fax: +47-22-547701, email: securitydialogue@prio.no, www.prio.no/sd.

Germany: Peace missions in the 21st century

In the first edition of 2004, the journal “S+F Sicherheit und Frieden - Security and Peace” concentrates mainly on the challenges facing current international peace missions. In his article Anthony W. Anderson looks into the growing importance of military peacekeeping forces within the framework of peace consolidation missions and illustrates practical steps for improving how effective these are. Against the background of a change in structure in the international system, Hans-Georg Ehrhart and Albrecht Schnabel analyze the options open to troops deployed on peacekeeping operations, and point to measures for reforming the security sector in the country in which the troops are being deployed. In her paper, Karin von Hippel concentrates on the question of the extent to which NATO and the EU are involved in international peacekeeping missions, with military action being in store for them and the UN being relegated to the civilian side. Finally, Ho-Won Jeong investigates the development of the peacekeeping concept as a tool for preventing conflicts and consolidating peace, paying particular attention to the consequences in the country in which the operation is taking place, as well as to the political objective and mandate of the operation.

The newly added rubric “Forum” in this edition contains articles by Heiko Borchert, Margret Johannsen, Henner Kirchner and Dieter H. Kollmer on areas outside the fixed topic of attitudes to peace and security.

Contact: S+F c/o IFSH, Falkenstein 1, 22587 Hamburg, Germany, Tel.: +49-40-8660770, Fax: +49-40-8663615, email: s-und-f@web.de, www.ifsh.de
Hessische Stiftung Friedens- und Konfliktforschung (HSFK)

HSFK-Reports (in German)


HSFK-Reports (in English)


HSFK-Standpunkte


Contact: Hessische Stiftung Friedens- und Konfliktforschung (HSFK), Leimenrode 29, 60322 Frankfurt/ Main, Germany, Tel.: +49-69-959104-0, Fax: +49-69-558481, email: info@hsfk.de, www.hsfk.de.
Germany: Security and peace at the beginning of the 21st century

The new edition of the anthology entitled “Sicherheit und Frieden zu Beginn des 21. Jahrhunderts. Konzeptionen – Akteure – Regionen” (Security and Peace at the beginning of the 21st century. Conceptions – Protagonists – Regions) edited by Mir A. Ferdowsi aims to contribute towards defining the ever more complex security concept by setting out the new global challenges in detail. The volume, commissioned by the Bavarian State Office for Political Education, is more than 500 pages long and is divided into four sections for the overall view of global difficulties: conceptions, protagonists, organizations, regions, so as to give a clear explanation of the expansion of the concept of security, aimed also at young people.

In the introduction “International politics at the beginning of the 21st century: Challenges and obstacles in the way of a stable security and peace order” Mir A. Ferdowsi first outlines the complex interdependencies of international politics in the 21st century, and tries to help clarify that world politics have continued to evolve in the same way since 11 September 2001, and that as a result the problems of the international community that existed previously are no less grave. The first section Conceptions contains the following articles: “Hegemony and Balance of Power” by Werner Link, “Collective Security” by Peter J. Opitz; Franz Nuschels in looks into the issue of “Global Governance” and Harald Mülller “Institutionalism and Regime”. Readers are familiarized with the “Dialogue of Cultures – Contexts and Orientations for Peace Policy” by Dieter Senghaas, and with “Humanitarian Intervention” by Bernhard Zangl. Volker Mattheis provides the final article, an elaboration on “Crisis Prevention and Peace Consolidation”.

The second section Protagonists begins with an article by Peter Rudolf on the subject of “The USA – Security Policy Conceptions and Controversies”, then proceeds via “Europe – From Civilian Power to Military Reactive Capacity” (Josef Janning) and “Transatlantic Relations” by Werner Weidenfeld to “Russia – From Euro-Atlantism to Putin’s Power Politics” (Hannes Adomeit), then further east with Peter J. Opitz’s “China – The Rise of the Dragon” and Hanns W. Maull’s article “Japan – Failed Aspirations as Global and Regional Civilian Power in East Asia”, before ending with “Transnational Terrorism” by Ulrich Schneckener.

The role of the Organizations is presented as follows: “Quo vadis NATO? From collective defence organization to open security community or to break-down?” (Matthias Dembinski), “OSCE – From Collective Security to Service Industry” (Peter Schlottner); Susanne Feske raises the question “ASEAN – An Economic or Security Community?”, Sabine Kurtenbach “OAS – From Instrument of US Politics to Democratic Security Community?” and Volker Mattheis “From the OAU to AU – On the Way to a Pax Africana?”.

The final section Regions contains on the one hand articles by Volker Perthes, “Near and Middle East – Incomplete Regime Building and the Quest for Regional Security” and Uwe Halbach, “The Caspian Sea Region – Between Great Game and the Silk Road”, and on the other hand the articles “South Asia – Large Region without Regionalism” (Joachim Betz) and “Southeast Europe – From the War of Succession to Stability” by Marie-Janine Calic.

Contact: Bayerische Landeszentrale für politische Bildungsarbeit, Brienner Straße 41, 80333 München, Germany, Tel.: +49-89-21862172, Fax: +49-89-21862180, email: landeszentrale@stmuk.bayern.de, www.km.bayern.de/blz

Germany: EU Security Policy in the Making

The publication by the Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy at the University of Hamburg entitled “Die Sicherheitspolitik der EU im Werden. Bedrohungen, Aktivitäten, Fähigkeiten” (EU security policy in the making. Threats, activities, capabilities) includes various articles by renowned scholars on the complex subject group to do with the future role of the European Union as an agent of security policy. In the introduction the editors Hans-Georg Ehrhart and Burkard Schmitt describe the progress of the European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP), but warn that the process might come to a stop because of material resources. In future Europe will have to look after the security of the continent and its borders itself.

In the first part of the book, Götz Neunew and Hans-Georg Ehrhart, among others, describe the threats and challenges facing Europe; in the following section Ottfried Nassauer, Matthias Dembinski and other authors describe the change in the European Union in the 21st century; in the third section, the EU is presented as an international agent (articles by e.g. Margret Johannsen) and the final section illustrates through essays by Burkard Schmitt, Reinhardt Rummel, and others, the aptitudes and means that the European Union has at its disposal for the future.

Contact: Institut für Friedensforschung und Sicherheitspolitik, Universität Hamburg, Falkensteiner 1, 22587 Hamburg, Germany, Tel.: +49-40-8660770, Fax: +40-40-8663165, email: ifsh@rz.uni-hamburg.de, www.ifsh.de

International: European Union – United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)

The European Commission and the United Nations Development Programme have concluded a strategic partnership agreement. This should improve joint activities in the fields of governance, conflict prevention and post-conflict reconstruction, by drawing on the strengths of each organization. This partnership will give the organizations the opportunity to improve their capacity for rapid intervention and to carry out well planned, well thought-out interventions, which will only in this way have a long-term effect. This partnership is intended to be the first of many that the Commission hopes to establish with other UN organizations. The Strategic Partnership will create a framework for activities that from now on will no longer be carried out on an ad-hoc basis, but through systematic and targeted collaboration to work towards achieving the Millennium Development Goals.

Contact and further details available from: www.europa.eu.int/comm/external_relations/un/ip04_june.htm

International: Disarmament, Demobilisation and Reintegration

The handbook entitled “Disarmament, Demobilisation and Reintegration. A Practical Field and Classroom Guide” was jointly produced by the Canadian Pearson Peacekeeping Centre, the Swedish National Defence College, the Norwegian Defence International Centre and the German Society for Technical Cooperation (GTZ). The handbook for civilian and military staff on peace missions and development programmes contains an overview of the best procedures and prescribed standards for disarmament, demobilisation and reintegration of former combatants. The organizations listed above teach these principles in preparatory courses for those taking part in UN peace missions. With this handbook the organizations hope to help make the work between peacekeeping troops and development cooperation organizations easier and give their staff neutral behaviour tips to take away with them.

In the first section the handbook provides a brief definition of disarmament, demobilisation and reintegration (DDR programmes) and explains the general contexts in which interventions and programmes take place. The three following chapters are concerned with the details of each individual aspect: first with disarmament, then demobilisation, and then reintegration. Finally the findings are summarized, and the suggestion made that cooperation on all levels is necessary, including between military and civilian organizations. The final part of the handbook contains a selection of check-lists, guidelines, technical standards, a bibliography and a list of common terms for the reader.
USA/Germany: The Fog of War

The film-documentary by Errol Morris consists of an interview that the film director conducted off-stage with the former US American defence minister Robert S. McNamara. Accompanied by in the main previously unseen archive material and newly declassified White House recordings, the documentary paints a worrying picture of decisions taken during 20th century wars and crises. The theories put forward by McNamara turn into a warning from a “Cold War veteran” who has developed over the years into an opponent of armaments. The topical relevance to the crises of the 21st century is clear. The 20th century delivered the foundation for today and the film raises the question as to the role that conflicts and possible nuclear disagreements might play in future.

Germany: The Fog of War - educational

The film-documentary has also been adapted for use in the classroom. It aims to familiarize students on the one hand with historical events and decisions of the 20th century which led to war and crises. On the other hand it aims to develop an awareness of the problems of military and civil conflicts nowadays. At the beginning of the book is a detailed analysis of the film, in which the various film techniques are discussed and the students given an understanding of stylistic devices, use of historical documents and much more. The second part of the book of the film gives teachers ideas for how to structure lessons, firstly by showing the points at which the film can be linked to different subject areas. Further use of the film also follows a pattern. First history has to be understood. Then the decisions have to be analyzed and evaluated. Finally, the lessons will be evaluated by the students.

Contact: Kulturfiliale Giltner und Conrad, Vera Conrad, Schnellersstr. 26, 80337 München, Germany, email: konrad@kulturfiliale.de and Movienet Film GmbH, Rosenheimer Str. 52, 81669 München, Germany, Tel.: +49-89-48953051, Fax: +49-89-48953056, www.movienetfilm.de, texts on methodical/educational lesson design: Karin Springer: karinspringer@gmx.net

Switzerland: Research venue for security policy

“Sicherheit wagen. Eine Entdeckungsgreise durch die Geschichte der schweizerischen Sicherheitspolitik seit dem Zweiten Weltkrieg” (Dare to have security. A voyage of discovery through the history of the Swiss security policy since the Second World War) is the title of a CD-ROM brought out by the Forschungsstelle Sicherheitspolitik der Eidgenössischen Technischen Hochschule Zürich. It is supposed to answer questions that have arisen for Swiss security policy as a result of the changes in world politics at the end of the 20th century. How should these opportunities and risks be confronted? Are proven concepts still up-to-date? Which new answers are yet to be discovered? The multimedia, interactive teaching software offers historic documents and explanatory texts, as well as a comprehensive, educationally adapted introduction to the history of the Swiss security policy since the Second World War.

Contact: Forschungsstelle für Sicherheitspolitik, ETH Zentrum SEI, 8092 Zürich, Schweiz, Tel.: +41-1-6324025, Fax: +41-1-6321941, email: css@epfl.gess.ethz.ch, www.css.ethz.ch

Germany: Pacifists in the sights of the judiciary

The first joint project by historians and lawyers is entitled, “Recht ist was den Waffen nützt. Justiz und Pazifismus im 20. Jahrhundert” (The law looks after those with weapons. Justice and Pacifism in the 20th century). Helmut Kramer and Wolfgang Wette have gathered together information on this oppressive chapter in German history from the Kaisereich to the present and have had lawyers and historians alike paint an overall picture of the relation between justice and pacifism during the war. The 20th century is clear. The 21st century and the world could be learned from history. The authors would like to show the students that lessons can and must be learned from history.

Contact: Suhrkamp Verlag, Lindenstrasse 29-35, 60325 Frankfurt am Main, Germany, Tel.: +49-69-756010, Fax: +49-69-75601314 oder -522, email: verkauf@suhrkamp.de, www.suhrkamp.de

Austria: Austrian Study Center for Peace and Conflict Resolution

The ÖSFK has brought out three new publications:


Due to a technical fault, the wrong text on the project entitled “Movement for UN-Reform 2007 – UNFOR 2007” was printed on page 8 of AFB-INFO 1/2004. The correct version can be found on the Internet at www.priub.org/afb_info/2004_1_en.pdf.

Please accept our apologies for any inconvenience.

Editorial team


Contact: Österreichisches Studienzen-rum für Frieden und Konfliktlösung (ÖSFK), Außenstelle Wien, Thomas Roithner, Wied- ner Gürtel 10, 1040 Wien, Austria, Tel.: +43-1-7969959, Fax: +43-1-79695711, email: aspr.vie@aspr.ac.at, www.aspr.ac.at

Syria: Modernisation and the Limits of Change

The new publication by Volker Perthes (ed. by International Institute for Strategic Stu- dies) “Syria under Bashar al-Asad: Modernisa- tion and the Limits of Change” highlights three main factors in the political process in Syria.

Firstly there is the resource factor: whatev-er the regime, Syria must secure the resources to meet growing social needs. Secondly, after nearly thirty years of the same government there has been a change in policy and at the same time a generatio- nal change. The third important factor is the changing regional, geopolitical conditions on Syria’s borders. Volker Perthes studies in detail the issue of the extent to which Syria will undergo further changes in the next few years and where it will meet the borders of modernization.

Contact: The International Institute for Strategic Studies, Arundel House, 13- 15 Arundel Street, Temple Place, London WC2R 3DX, Great Britain, www.iiss.org

Romania: Developing Local Support for Third – Neutral Intervention in Ethnic Conflicts

The report entitled “Developing Local Support for Third – Neutral Intervention in Ethnic Conflicts”, is the result of a pro- ject run by the Foundation for Democratic Change (FDC), together with the Institute for Crime Research and Prevention (ICRP) and the Resource Center for Roma Com- munities (RCRC) from September 2003 to April 2004. The project was a continuation of the training programme “Prevention and Resolution of Inter-ethnic Conflicts” developed in 2002. In its first section the project report looks at the context and national strategy for improving the situation of the Sinti and Roma people in Romania. This is followed by a brief overview of the project: risk factors, the strategic priorities of preven- tion and resolution of inter-ethnic conflicts between 2001 and 2004, and examples of what has been achieved in each case. The next section details the information necessary for neutral intervention, such as technical support and consultancy, organization of local workshops and the special importance of networking. After describing the various kinds of intervention possible, the conclusi- on summarizes the project results once more and puts forward guidelines for action.

Contact: Foundation for Democratic Change (FDC), Calea Victoriei 83, bl. 81, sc.A, ap.10, Bucuresti, sector 1, 010066, Romania, Tel.: +40-21-212-7923 Fax: +40-21-311-2815, email: office@fdc.org.ro, www.fdc.org.ro

Germany: Friedensgutachten 2004

The Institut für Entwicklung und Frieden (INEF: Institute for Development and Peace), the Forschungsstätte der Evangelischen Stu- diengemeinschaft (FEST: Protestant Institute for Interdisciplinary Research), the Institut für Friedensforschung und Sicherheitspolitik at the University of Hamburg (IFSH: Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy), the Hessische Stiftung Friedens- und Konflikt- forschiung (HSFK: Peace Research Institute Frankfurt, or PRIF) and the Bonn International Center for Conversion (BICC) have combined to produce the Friedensgutachten 2004 (editorial team: Chris- toph Weller, Ulrich Ratsch, Reinhard Mutz, Bruno Schoch and Corinna Hauswedell).

The current edition of the Gutachten is dedicated to an investigation of how suc- cessful peace strategies might look in the face of the latest round of war-making and violent conflict in which they have been discarded. Particular attention is paid to the role of Europe and that of international justice and international cooperation in the world. Furthermore, examples of peace proces- ses and their crises are examined, e.g. the evolution of the conflicts in Iraq, the Middle East, Central Asia, Bolivia and Sri Lanka. What can be done in such cases to prevent the escalation of violence and pro- mote social development? The protagonists are scrutinized to see if they are pursuing the appropriate peace strategies. Can colla- boration between civilians and the military, international police missions or the private sector play an innovative role within the framework of peace strategies? Finally, the Friedensgutachten 2004 analyzes the role of Germany in international security policy, efforts for improved crisis prevention and current policy regarding Islam in Germany.

Contact: Institut für Entwicklung und Frieden (INEF), Universität Duisburg-Essen, Geibelstr. 41, 47048 Duisburg, Germany, Tel.: +49-203-3794420, Fax: +49-203-3794425, email: info@uni-duisburg.de, www.inef.de, Friedensgutachten can be ordered at: www.friedensgutachten.de

Germany: Friedensgutachten 2004 educational

Teaching aids and materials on the four main topic areas in the Friedensgutachten 2004 have been published by the Tübingen Institut für Friedenspädagogik. In the first section, the Friedensgutachten 2004 is concerned on an educational level with current threats to peace, such as terrorism and the War in Iraq. The aim is to give students an understanding of security policy with the aid of the special orientation towards European and German security policy, European con- stitutional policy and civil conflict manage- ment. Finally, the publication focuses on Human Security, investigating various secu- rity concepts, the fight against poverty and the “civilizational hexagon”. The final section gives a clear description of the current peace process and plans for the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. The Friedensgutachten 2004 educa- tional edition additionally includes nume- rous diagrams, photographs, cartoons and educational tips for better communication of topics to do with peace and security policy in the field of education.

Contact: Institut für Friedenspädagogik Tübingen e.V., Günther Gugel, Uli Jäger, Corrensstr. 12, 72076 Tübingen, Germany, Tel.: +49-7071-920510, Fax: +49-7071-9205111, email: kontakt@friedenspaedagogik.de, www.friedenspaedagogik.de

Germany: Master of Peace Studies

AFB-INFO 1/2004 gave notice of the new Master of Peace Studies course at the Fernuniversität Hagen. The first modules began this winter semester.

Prospective students will also be interest- ed to know about the fees for this corres- pondence course, which can be undertaken without giving up the day job. The fees amount to some EUR 5,600.00 in total, and can be broken down as follows:

Basic fees: semester fee: EUR 50.00, mo- dule fee: EUR 800.00, final master’s exami- nation: EUR 500.00; Revision fees: module examination: EUR 100.00, part assessment of module: EUR 50.00, final master’s exama- nation: EUR 500.00.
Deutsche Stiftung Friedensforschung – DSF
New Series of Publications

DSF Forschung

The DSF Forschung series publishes the findings of research projects funded by the foundation. The aim is to present the results in easily accessible language, addressed at readers from both an academic and a practical background.

The first issue in this new series is a study by Dr. Stephan Böckenförde on the topic

Die War Powers Resolution als ein mögliches Modell für ein Entsendegesetz/Parlamentsbeteiligungsgesetz
(The War Powers Resolution as a possible model for a Posted Workers Act)

The above study looks into the topical subject of the deployment of German armed forces abroad, which is likely to increase in future. The German Parliament is to pass the Posted Workers Act (Entsendegesetz) before the end of this parliamentary term. Böckenförde investigates the American War Powers Resolution, which has provided a legal framework for military deployments since 1973. The author finds certain points in this resolution that ought to be taken into consideration for the German parliamentary act. The study also draws attention to the fact that an armed forces duties act ought to be created in addition to the Posted Workers Act.

Forum DSF

The Forum DSF Series entitled “Die Friedensforschung vor neuen Herausforderungen” (New challenges facing peace studies) is intended by the Foundation to inform interested parties about programming and events. The second title in the series is now available and contains papers from four events under the heading “Stimuli for peace research and politics. Status and future development of the Foundation’s activities”. These address basic issues and prospects for peace research from a variety of perspectives.

The first paper, entitled “Challenges for peace research at the beginning of the 21st century” by Volker Rittberger, covers a conference on the prospects for peace research held back in November 2003, dedicated posthumously to Dieter S. Lutz. The second section of the publication contains papers by Theo Sommer and Volker Rittberger from the Joint Meeting of the DSF Academic Council. The main topics here are on the one hand the international community, and on the other the DSF’s duties, evolution and consultation requirements.

The lectures at the professional discussion conference between the DSF and CDU/CSU and SPD political parties are reproduced in the next section of the publication. Main topics focused upon here are security, armament and international relations.

The appendix features elaboration of the main subject areas being sponsored by the Deutsche Stiftung Friedensforschung 2000-2004.

Contact: Deutsche Stiftung Friedensforschung, Am Ledenhof 3-5, 49074 Osnabrück, Germany, Tel.: +49-541-6003542, Fax: +49-541-60079039, email: info@bundesstiftung-friedensforschung.de, www.bundesstiftung-friedensforschung.de

European Master in Mediation

The Institut Universitaire Kurt Bösch is offering a two-year, post-graduate study programme, the European Master in Mediation, which has the following objectives:

- to sharpen awareness Europe-wide of the role of mediation in the face of current changes in social bonds and social regulations;
- to create an interdisciplinary approach to the topic of mediation;
- to develop research in mediation at European level;
- and to broaden access to the European culture of mediation.

The Master’s programme is organized in partnership with various universities, and the quality of the course is guaranteed by a European Scientific Council (consisting of a representative from each partner university, the Master’s programme team leaders and other experts). The two-year programme begins with a year in a partner university or institution offering mediation courses (institutes with suitable programmes are defined by the Scientific Council). The second year is spent at the Institut Universitaire Kurt Bösch, and includes residential modules spread over 15 months, national and international internships and a Master’s thesis. Students must earn at least 60 ECTS (European Credits Transfer System) credits per year of the course.

Those not wishing to do the Master’s thesis can nonetheless gain a certificate in mediation (European Certificate in Mediation). Those who successfully qualify as a European Master in Mediation can use this to work as a mediation manager at European level or to enrol upon a course of further study.

Fees for the course amount to some EUR 3,342.00. This does not include transport to the internship sites, food or accommodation.

Contact: Institut Universitaire Kurt Bösch, Unité Médiation, Isabelle Léger/Rachel Méthard, CP 4176, 1950 Sion 4, Switzerland, Tel.: +41-27-2057300, Fax: +41-27-7301, email: mediation@iukb.ch, www.iukb.ch

International: UNESCO/EURED In-Service Teacher Training Course

The course on “Human Rights and Peace Education in Europe” 2004-2006 can chalk up its first successful results after the first module. The course began in summer 2004, aiming to turn teachers, directors and managers of educational institutions into successful communicators of ideas for promoting peace and human rights. The fact that the course participants worked so well together indicates a change in the world of education and ushers the idea of a culture of peace a little closer.

Contact: Österreichisches Studienzentrum für Frieden und Konfliktlösung, Ursula E. Gamauf, UNESCO/EURED Course Coordinator, Außenstelle Wien, Wiedner Gürtel 10, Wien, Austria, Tel: +43-1-4092402, Fax: +43-1-7965711 email: gamauf@aspr.ac.at, www.aspr.ac.at/eured.htm

Germany: Hessische Stiftung Friedens- und Konfliktforschung

In a special edition of studies by the Hessische Stiftung Friedens- und Konfliktforschung the editors Christian Büttner, Regine Mehl, Peter Schlaffer and Mechthild Nauck have collected the findings of two
Working Papers:

Reports:

Contact: Danish Institut for International Studies, DIIS, Strandgade 56, 1401 Kopenhagen, Denmark, Tel +45-3269-8787, Fax +45-3269-8700, email: jfr@diis.dk, www.diis.dk

conferences on the topic of “Children inside/outside war and crisis zones” (March and September 2003 in Bonn and Frankfurt/M.). The first part of the documentation generated deals with refugee children in Germany. In the first article Christian Böttner explains that the view of childhood and youth in western industrialized nations is different from that in crisis regions. Ursula Neumann looks into the situation of unaccompanied refugee children, whose lives are characterized by continuous insecurity. The article is clarified by examples of cases. In a third article Guido Schmitt proposes possible ways of treating refugee children at school so as to improve their educational requirements. Svetlana Vučelić presents a special approach, as she is able to speak from personal experience of having been a refugee, and can furthermore illustrate the case of traumatized girls using real cases as examples.
The second part of the publication is introduced by Peter Steudtner on the subject of demobilization and reintegration in war and crisis zones. He describes experiences in Mozambique, where child soldiers are offered cleansing and healing rituals to overcome their traumatic experiences, so that they can reintegrate into the social community. Dietmar Roller reports on the everyday experiences of children in Afghanistan and Sri Lanka and demonstrates that there is too little support on the part of international organizations, especially in the case of medical and psychological care of war victims. Colombian journalist Guillermo Gonzáles Uribe elaborates on the effects of continual violent conflicts on children in his homeland, and explains that their only escape route is often membership of a paramilitary group. “Poverty and AIDS in Kenya” is the title of Agnes Mailu’s article, about her aid project with impoverished and sick women and their children in Kenya and Mombasa. The following article looks at the problems surrounding the return home of child soldiers in West and Central Africa. Jean-Claude Legrand’s reflections focus on the issue of social reintegration of female child soldiers, for whom it is much more difficult to receive appropriate help in comparison to their male fellow sufferers in a society that promotes virginity before marriage. Eyad Sarraj comments on educational therapeutic approaches for the “intifada children”, to stem the manipulation and the mutual propagation of enemy images. Another article on the long-term trauma of children of war in Bosnia and Croatia, by Marija Kešć, describes in particular the situation of children who are still living in refugee camps today and who have no future prospects. On the subject of war and crisis zones, Jorge Scholz presents
the geographical, historical, economic and political relations in Pakistan. The main focus of attention here is the difference between artificially drawn-up and natural ethnic borders.

The third part of the publication is entitled “Living conditions and assistance in Germany” and is concerned with the opportunities for and limitations on offering support in Germany to children from war and crisis zones. Different educational fields are covered and therapeutic experiences described in detail. Ilka Lennertz uses her research work to describe how ignoring psychological wounds can have grave consequences for later trauma development. Hubertus Adam gives another psychiatric viewpoint, aiming to show the way from trauma to reconciliati- on. Mechthild Nauck presents experiences from pre-school educational theory and with the aid of a concrete concept from a children’s nursery in Frankfurt illustrates that the work with the children has gone very well. In contrast, Tanja Kraushofer investigates the basic problems and enormous burden for teachers caring for refugee children or young people. Helena Barkić-Deinhardt discusses her own therapeutic experiences and writes about her post-traumatic life. Finally, Dieter Lotz describes the aid available for children from war and crisis zones from the logotherapeutic point of view: life as a quest for meaning.

The last part of the publication, “Necessary outline conditions”, is introduced by Bernhard Meyer with an article on the relation between therapy and political outline conditions. Tanja Kraushofer now adds the political administrative aspects to her first article in the form of political argumentation from the perspective of Aus- trian specialist associations for assisting children and young people. Gretel Wildt describes the outlook and requirements for improving the outline conditions of education and therapy from the German perspective, as formulated by the main German children’s and young people’s specialist aid organizations.

The publication ends with a presenta- tion of images painted by children in war and crisis situations. Anja Kuhr presents the images and gives a detailed commen- tary of them.

Germany: Zentrum für Internationale Friedenseinsätze (ZIF)

“Organized Crime as an Obstacle to Successful Peacebuilding. Lessons Learned from the Balkans, Afghanistan and West Africa” is the title of the report on the 7th International Berlin Workshop run by ZIF. Between 11-13 December 2003 rep- resentatives of international organizations and international peace interventions met in Berlin, to discuss the parallels in the dynamics of organized crime in the various countries in which action was being undertaken. The description of the discus- sion is preceded by a detailed list of the protagonists and their duties in the crisis regions. The role of organized crime, inter- national police missions, the military and the international criminal courts is discus- sed in detail. The report then goes on to discuss the individual cases of the Balkans, Afghanistan and West Africa. The common aspects of the dynamic of organized crime, armed conflict, disintegration of the state and terrorism are brought out as much as the differences in situations specific to each country. Construction of a criminal justice system and military interventions are considered particularly important as proposed solutions. A further area of study is the tools and methods supposed to put a stop to organized crime. The underlying trend of this report is unity over taking ra- pid action.

Contact: Zentrum für Internationale Fried- denseinsätze (ZIF), Ludwigkirchplatz 3-4, 1071 Berlin, Germany, Tel.: +49-30-52005650 Fax: +49-30-520056590, email: research@zif-berlin.org, www.zif-berlin.org

Germany: In favour of a culture of differences

The investigation entitled “In favour of a culture of differences. Journals about peace and the third world put to the test”, com- missioned by the Evangelische Akademie Iserlohn and organized by Jörg Becker and Christian Flatz, is a study into the image of abroad and of strangers in the alterna- tive press. It carries out a critical analysis of examples of journals in the light of the question, how is the image of the foreigner portrayed in journals that proclaim them- selves to be “alternative”? Does it appear to be qualitatively different from that in main- stream media? The following journals are investigated in the study: epd-Entwicklungs- politik, INKOTA-Brief zum Nord-Süd-Kon- flikt und zur konziliaren Bewegung, Zivil – Zeitschrift für Frieden und Gewaltfreiheit, Blätter des Informationszentrums 3. Welt (iz3m), Friedensforum, Rundbrief der Fried- densbewegung and Et cetera. Even if they favour a view of the world from the perspec- tive of the elite nations, it does at least offer an alternative to mainstream media.

Contact: Institut für Kirche und Ge- sellschaft, Helga Weber, Berliner Platz 12, 58638 Iserlohn, Germany, Tel.: +49-2371-352143, Fax: +49-2371-352130, email: h.weber@kircheundgesellschaft.de, www.kircheundgesellschaft.de

International: Central and Eastern European Online Library (CEEOL)

CEEOL is an online archive, that provi- des access to articles, academic journals, eBooks and digital documents, on the sub- ject of Europe and more particularly Central and Eastern European topics. The following journals are available, among others, in the field of political sciences:

- Politicka Misao (Political Thought), quarterly published by the Faculty for Political Sci- ence at the University of Zagreb, Croatia
- Mezinárodní vztahy (International Relation- ships), quarterly published by the Insti- tute for International Relations, Prague, Czech Republic
- Politologický casopis (Journal of Political Science), quarterly published by the Institute of Political Science at the University of Masaryk, in Brno, Czech Republic
- Studia Universitatis Babes-Bolyai – series Studia Europaea, twice yearly journal published by the University of Babes- Bolyai in Cluj-Napoca, Romania
- Revista Româna de Stiinte Politice (The Romanian Journal of Political Sciences), quarterly published by the Romanian Academic Society in Bucharest, Romania
- Erasmus – casopis za kulturnu demokraciju (Erasmus), bimonthly published by the Erasmus Gilda in Zagreb, Croatia
- Transitions Online, online daily publi- shed by “Transitions Online” in Prague, Czech Republic
- Aktuelle Ostinformationen (Current in- formation about the East), twice yearly publication from the Institute for pan- European Studies in Vlotho, Germany
- Osteuropa (Eastern Europe), monthly pub- lished in Germany
- Blätter für deutsche und internationa- le Politik (Papers on German and in- ternational Policy), published twice a month by the Blätter Verlagsgesellschaft in Bonn, Germany
- Ost-Probleme (Problems of the East), published twice a month in Germany
- SEER – South East Europe Review. For Labour and Social Affairs, quarterly pub- lished by the Nomos-Verlag in Baden- Baden, Germany
- Die Neue Gesellschaft – Frankfurter Hefte (The New Society – Frankfurt Booklets), published by the Friedrich- Ebert-Stiftung in Berlin, Germany
- JAVA (The Week), weekly published by Kelmendi publishing house in Pristina, Kosovo
- Pravo-zashitnik (Human Rights Defend- er), quarterly published by the Human Rights publishers in Moscow, Russia
The number of journals included, from which users can select the articles they need free of any time constraints or contractual obligations, and the timespan covered by the archive are constantly being expanded.

Contact: Cosmina Berta, Central and Eastern European Online Library, Offenbacher Landstraße 368, 60399 Frankfurt, Germany, Tel.: +49-69-68602514, Fax: +49-69-65009682, email: cberta@ceool.com, www.ceool.com

New Literature in the AFB Reference Library

The following publications were received or purchased by the AFB office between March and September 2004 and may be consulted in the AFB reference library.

Peace Research / Basic Research


German Peace Research Publications in English


Bundesregierung (Hg.): Aktionsplan “Zivile Krisenprävention, Konfliktlösung und Friedenskonsolidierung”. Berlin, 12. Mai 2004, 68 S.


Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit u.a. (Hg.): Disarmament, Demobilisation and Reintegration. A Practical Field and Classroom Guide. Frankfurt 2004, 152 S.

Deutscher Entwicklungsdienst (Hg.): Zivile Konfliktbearbeitung und Friedensförderung. Bonn 2004, 31 S.


Forum Ziviler Friedensdienst (Hg.): Frieden braucht Fachleute. Die Qualifizierung für zivile Konfliktbearbeitung / Zivilen Friedensdienst. Bonn 2002, 15 S.

Friedensentwicklung (Hg.): Strategic Partnership for Peace. Opportunities and Limits of Linkages among Peace Activities as a Way to Strengthen Effectiveness. Workshop Documentation, Bonn 23. Oktober 2003. 6 S.


Lange, Maria/Quinn, Mick: Conflict, Humanitarian Assistance and Peacebuilding: Meeting the Challenges. International Alert: London 2003, 28 S.


OSCE Europe New European Security Issues


Dresdener Studiengemeinschaft Sicherheitspolitik (Hg.): Gemeinsame Sicherheit - ein schwieriger Lernprozess. DSS-Arbeitspapiere 70/2004, 187 S.


Gál, Kinga (Ed.): Minority Governance in Europe. European Centre for Minority Issues: Budapest 2002, 378 S.
Wagner, Wolfgang: Für Europa sterben? Die
Schoch, Bruno: Zypern wird EU-Mitglied
Müller, Harald: Demokratie, die Medien
Jenichen, Anne: Kooperative Friedensför
Schielberg, Silke: Die Ambivalenz der neuen


North-South Relations Development

Bayer AG (Hg.): Nachhaltigkeitsbericht 2004. Leverkusen 2004, 151 S.


Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (Hg.): Joint Utstein Study of Peacebuilding. National Report from Germany, Eschborn 2003, 88 S.


Conflicts and Crises Wars and Causes of War


Binder, Martin: Der Einsatz von Söldnerfirmen durch gewählte Regierungen - eine „Antinomie des Demokratischen Friedens“? Abteilung Internationale Beziehungen/Friedens- und Konfliktforschung der Universität Tübingen: Tübinger Arbeitspapiere zur Internationalen Politik und Friedensforschung Nr. 44/2004, 54 S.


**Middle East Central Asia and Asia Pacific Region**


Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte: Schwerpunkt „Arabische Welt und Islam“. B 37/2003, 54 S.

Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte: Schwerpunkt: „Iran“. B 9/2004, 54 S.


Glatzer, Bernt: Konfliktanalyse Afghanistan. Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung/FriEnt/ gtz: Bonn 2003, 43 S.


Klieman, Aharon: Constructive Ambiguity in Middle East Peace-Making. The Tami Steinmetz Center for Peace Research: Tel Aviv University: Research Reports Series 10/1999, 156 S.


**North Africa Sub-Saharan Africa**

Arbeitsgruppe Erdölpunkt-Tschad-Kamerun (Hg.): Das Tschad-Kamerun-Öl- und Pipeline-Projekt. Öl - Macht - Armut! Mühltal 2003, 34 S.


North America


Hennes, Michael: Der neue Militärisch-Industrielle Komplex in den USA. In: Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte, B 46/2003, S. 41 - 46. 8sonst Rüstung)


Security Policy and Armament

Arms Conversion and Disarmament


Auswärtiges Amt (Hg.): Bericht zur Rüstungskontrolle, Abrüstung und Nichtverbreitung 2003. Berlin 2004, 193 S.


Daase, Christopher/Feske, Susanne: Rüstungskontrolle in Asien: Regionale Konzepte und ihre Erfolgspanierungen. In: Sicherheit und Frieden, Jg. 21, 2/2003, S. 70 - 75.


Meier, Oliver/Aken, Jan van: Politische Handlungsmöglichkeiten zur Kontrolle biologischer Waffen. In: Sicherheit und Frieden, Jg. 21, 2/2003, S. 75 - 81.


Verification Research, Training and Information Centre (Ed.): Time to lay down the law: National legislation to enforce the BWC. London 2003, 48 S.

**Germany**

**Peace and Security Policy**


Fischer, Martina: Für Umbau und Abrüstung der Bundeswehr im Rahmen einer europäischen Friedenspolitik - die Stärkung der Friedenskompetenzen ist die Aufgabe. Manuskript, Berlin 2004, 9 S.

Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung (Hg.): Zur Transformation der Bundeswehr. Die Zukunft der Allgemeinen Wehrpflicht in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Bonn 2004, 33 S.


**Globalization**

**Global Governance**


Hein, Wolfgang/Voegeli, Wolfgang (Hg.): GATS und globale Politik. Deutsches Übersee-Institut: Hamburg 2004, 199 S.

Kurtenbach, Sabine/Lock, Peter (Hg.): Kriege als (Uber)Lebenswelten. Schattenumstände und Bewältigungsstrategien. Campus Verlag: Frankfurt 2004, 243 S.

**Global Threats**


Oswald Spring, Ursula (Ed.): Resolución Noviolenta de Conflictos am Sociedad de Indígenas y Minorías. El Colegio de Tlaxcalta 2004, 502 S.


Peace Education
Socio-psychological Peace Research

Feilitzen, Cecilia von/Carlsson, Ulla (Ed.): Promote or Protect? Perspectives on Media Literacy and Media Regulations. The International Clearinghouse on Children, Youth and Media: Göteborg 2003, 260 S.


Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung (Hg.): Frauen in Friedensbewegungen. Rat für Entwicklungsförderung in Zusammenarbeit mit der Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung, Bonn 2004, 75 S.

Institut für Friedens und Demokratie/Fern Universität in Hagen: Interdisziplinäres Weiterbildungsstudium „Master of Peace Studies“. Hagen 2004, 9 S.


Pacifism and Non-violence
Ethics of Peace

Christliche Friedensdienste (Hg.): Frieden in Gerechtigkeit. In: epd Dokumentation 48/2003, 30 S.


Kooperation für den Frieden (Hg.): Friedenspolitisch-zeitliche Linien. Bonn 2003, 12 S.


Ronnefeldt, Clemens: Krieg ist keine Lösung - Alternativen sind möglich. Internationaler Versöhnungsbund: Waldkirch 2004, 4 S.

Sharp, Gene: There are realistic Alternatives. The Albert Einstein Institution: Boston 2003, 54 S.

12 October 2004
“Women, Peace and Civil Society”. The aim of this conference is to look at peace promotion and conflict prevention by women, activities that are a central feature of the “1000 women for the Nobel Peace Prize 2005” project. Organized by the Geographical Institute at the University of Berne and the Interdisciplinary Centre for Women’s and Gender Studies.

Contact: Universität Bern, Katharina Gelller, Hochschulsstr. 4, 3012 Berne, Switzerland, Tel.: +41-31-3301085, Fax: +41-31-3301213, email: info@1000peacewomen.org, www.1000peacewomen.org

15-16 October 2004
“Banal Militarism: On the banalization of military and warlike disposition.” International and interdisciplinary conference at the Zentrum für Konfliktforschung (Marburg) and the Bundes demokratischer Wissenschaftlerinnen und Wissenschaftler (BdW).

Contact: Universität Marburg, Dr. Tanja Thomas, Gutenbergstraße 18, 35032 Marburg, Germany, Tel.: +49-6421-2824503 or: +49-6421-2823627, Fax: +49-6421-2824281, email: office@banal-militarism.de, www.banal-militarism.de

15-17 October 2004
“Think about the right priority when peace action put to the test!”. Joint study day / 3rd “non-violent action” research day by IFG K and AG “Güterkunde” Critical review of current research projects from the theoretical academic, inter-cultural and practical perspectives.

Contact: Institut für Friedensarbeit und gewaltfreie Konfliktauflösung, Hauptstraße 35, 55491 Wahlenau, Germany, Tel.: +49-6453-980096, Fax: +49-6453-500636, email: ChSweitzer@GFK@aol.com, www.ifgk.de

22 October 2004

Contact: Groupe de Recherche et d’Information sur la Paix et la Sécurité (GRIP), 33, rue Van Hoorend, 1030 Brussels, Belgium, Tel.: +32-2-2418420, Fax: +32-2-2451933, email: adim@grp.org, www.grp.org

23 October 2004

Contact: Hamburger Gesellschaft zur Förderung der Demokratie und des Völkerrechts e.V. in collaboration with Human Rights Watch.

Contact: Hamburger Gesellschaft zur Förderung der Demokratie und des Völkerrechts e.V., Muttenwietel 1, 20459 Hamburg, Germany, Tel.: +49-40-36903245, Fax: +49-40-36903264, email: boever@voelkerrecht-hamburg.de, www.voelkerrecht-hamburg.de

27 October 2004
“Threats to security and strategies for a regional security policy in Northeast Asia”. Foreign policy research symposium at the Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung.

Contact: Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung Berlin, Hufschmittstr. 17, 10785 Berlin, Germany, Tel.: +49-30-26935863, email: renate.efferoth-hering@fes.de, www.fes.de

Meetings & Events 2004/2005

7 October 2004

Contact: Landeszentrale für politische Bildung Rheinland-Pfalz, Dr. Rüdiger Schлага, Referatleiter, Am Kronberger Hof 6, 55116 Mainz, Germany, Tel.: +49-6131–162977, Fax: +49-6131–162978, email: ruedeger.schlagl@politische-bildung-rlp.de, www.politische-bildung-rlp.de

27 October 2004
“Women, Peace and Civil Society”. The aim of this conference is to look at peace promotion and conflict prevention by women, activities that are a central feature of the “1000 women for the Nobel Peace Prize 2005” project. Organized by the Geographical Institute at the University of Berne and the Interdisciplinary Centre for Women’s and Gender Studies.

Contact: Universität Bern, Katharina Gelller, Hochschulsstr. 4, 3012 Berne, Switzerland, Tel.: +41-31-3301085, Fax: +41-31-3301213, email: info@1000peacewomen.org, www.1000peacewomen.org
28 October 2004
“War and Peace in the Middle East – Study of Causes,” Lecture by the Studiengesellschaft für Friedensforschung e.V., München

Contact: Studiengesellschaft für Friedensforschung e.V., Vorsitzende Monika Mirus-Küpper, Aldringenstraße 10, 80369 München, Germany, Tel.: +49-921-3301212, Fax: +49-921-3301213, email: info@studiengesellschaftfriedensforschung.de, Fax: +49-921-3301213, www.studiengesellschaftfriedensforschung.de

1-2 November 2004
“Rule of Law. The promotion of legality and legal certainty in development and peace processes”, International workshop discussion at the Evangelische Akademie Loccum and GTZ.

Contact: Evangelische Akademie Loccum, Prof. Jörg Calließ, Münchehäger Straße 6, 31547 Rehburg-Loccum, Germany, Tel.: +49-5766-81109, Fax: +49-5766-81900, email: Jörg.Calliess@evlka.de, www.loccum.de

2 November 2004

Contact: Schweizerische Friedensstiftung (swisspeace), Sonnenbergstr. 17 Postfach, CH-3000 Bern 7, Switzerland, Tel.: +41-31-3301212, Fax: +41-31-3301213, email: info@swisspeace.ch, www.swisspeace.org

15 November 2004
“In between new front lines? Civilian-military cooperation in development cooperation”. The second Freiburger Symposium on development issues, organized by the Arnold-Bergstraesser-Institut.

Contact: Arnold-Bergstraesser-Institut, Windaustr. 16, 79110 Freiburg, Germany, Tel.: +49-761-888780, Fax: +49-761-8887878, email: abi@abi.uni-freiburg.de, www.arnold-bergstraesser.de

18-20 November 2004

Contact: INCORE, University of Ulster, Magee Campus, Aberfoyle House, Northland Road, Londonderry, BT48 7JA, UK, Tel.: +44-28-71375500, Fax: +44-28-71375510, email:secretary@incore.ulst.ac.uk, www.incore.ulst.ac.uk

6 December 2004
“European Foreign and Security Policy”. Lecture by the Studiengesellschaft für Friedensforschung e.V. in Munich.

Contact: Studiengesellschaft für Friedensforschung e.V., Vorsitzende Monika Mirus-Küpper, Aldringenstraße 10, 80369 München, Germany, Tel.: +49-921-3301212, Fax: +49-921-3301213, email: info@studiengesellschaftfriedensforschung.de, www.studiengesellschaftfriedensforschung.de

6/7 December

Contact: Danish Institute for International Studies (DIIS), Conference Section, Strandgade 25, 1401 Copenhagen K, Denmark, Tel.: +45-35-324940, Fax: +45-32-698700, email: event@diis.dk, www.diis.dk

9-10 December 2004
“Peace through peaceful means”. TRANSCEND Workshop with Johan Galtung. TRANSCEND.

Contact: Evangelische Akademie Iserlohn, Referat Frieden, Uwe Trittmann, Berliner Platz 12, 58638 Iserlohn, Germany, Tel.: +49-2371-352180, Fax: +49-2371-352130, email: u.trittmann@kircheundgesellschaft.de, www.ev-akademie-iserlohn.de

10-12 December 2004

Contact: Evangelische Akademie Loccum, Prof. Jörg Calließ, Münchehäger Straße 6, 31547 Rehburg-Loccum, Germany, Tel.: +49-3766-81109, Fax: +49-3766-81900, email: Jörg.Calliess@evlka.de, www.loccum.de

22-24 November 2004
“Archives and Records for Boundary Dispute Resolution” So as to be able to use the National Archive and the British Library, this workshop will be held in London.

Contact: University of Durham, Department of Geography, Michelle Speak, Durham DH1 3LE, Great Britain, Fax: +44-191-3341961, Fax: +44-191-3341962, email: IBRU@durham.ac.uk, www-bru.dur.ac.uk

25-27 November 2004
“When Words Collide – Conference on Language and Interpretation in Divided Societies.” The International Conflict and Research Institute of the University of Ulster is issuing an invitation to an international colloquium on the importance of language and interpretation of language in Ireland and other divided societies.

Contact: INCORE, University of Ulster, Magee Campus, Aberfoyle House, Northland Road, Londonderry, BT48 7JA, UK, Tel.: +44-28-71375500, Fax: +44-28-71375510, email:secretary@incore.ulst.ac.uk, www.incore.ulst.ac.uk

2-5 May 2005

Contact: GIPRI, Voie Creuse 16, 1202 Geneva, Switzerland, Tel.: +41-22-9197940, Fax: +41-22-9197943, email: gipri@gscp.ch, www.gipri.ch

10-16 July 2005
22nd Schlaininger Summer Academy by the Austrian Study Center for Peace and Conflict Resolution at Burg Schlaining.

Contact: Österreichisches Studienzentrum für Frieden und Konfliktlösung (OSKF), Außenstelle Wien, Thomas Rothfeder, Wiednergürtel 10, 1040 Wien, Austria, Tel.: +43-1-7969959, Fax: +43-1-7962711, email: asp.vie@asp.ac.at, www.asp.ac.at

19 August – 5 September 2005
(exact dates not known at time of going to press) Summer course of the Institut International de Recherches pour la paix a Genève (GIPRI).

Contact: GIPRI, Voie Creuse 16, 1202 Geneva, Switzerland, Tel.: +41-22-9197940, Fax: +41-22-9197943, email: gipri@gscp.ch, www.gipri.ch

7-11 November 2005
“LIVING with Risk – How should we deal with the new threats?” Seminar on future research, offering approaches for assessing the consequences of current political measures.

Contact: Georg-von-Vollmar-Akademie, Schloß Asparagus, 82431 Kochel am See, Germany, Tel.: +49-8851-7800, Fax: +49-8851-7823, email: info@georg-vollmar-akademie.de, www.vollmar-akademie.de