



Important note: Of the five Master's degree courses presented below, that at Marburg was accredited unconditionally in March 2004. That at Hagen is still in the process of being accredited. The first Master's course in development at Frankfurt-am-Main will begin in the winter semester 2005/2006 at the latest, and will therefore be presented in AFB-INFO at a later date. The other courses (Hamburg, Magdeburg) have already been running for a short while, or will begin, in the case of Marburg and Tübingen, in the winter semester 2004/2005.

Master in Peace and Conflict Studies - New graduate study courses in Germany

0. Foreword

From the winter semester 2004/05 five German universities will be offering Master's degree courses in Peace and Conflict Studies, which will meet European standards in terms of organizational structure and content and will reinforce the role of peace studies at university level in Germany.¹

On an international scale Germany lags far behind in the options it offers for academic education in the field of peace and conflict studies. Germany thus holds little international attraction in this field for either students or practising academics, although there is a considerable socio-political demand for specialist staff in peace and conflict studies. To date, professional qualifications have been on offer only at the following institutions: at Tübingen as the course with the main emphasis on International Relations/Peace and Conflict Studies in the political sciences major of the Master's degree; at Marburg as a

subsidiary course in Master's and PhD courses; and at Hagen as a fee-paying further education course in Peace and Conflict Studies. The restructuring of the education system recently brought in at universities, following the introduction of new graduate degree courses in the field of peace studies, is an attempt to expand the education on offer in this field such that prospective academics with a particular interest in peace-related issues will now be able to apply for the necessary professional qualification in suitable study programmes.

1. Target group

The target group for the new courses on offer at the universities of Hamburg, Magdeburg, Tübingen, Marburg and the FernUniversität Hagen (German equivalent of the Open University) is motivated, hard-working students who have successfully completed a first degree or equivalent qualification in political science or a related social science. These study courses aim to cater for all students who are especially interested in issues to do with peace and conflict studies and

international politics, and who want to improve their competence and broaden their knowledge in this field.

For those students working towards a professional career in the fields of peace studies or peace and security policy in practice, the aim is to create an opportunity for them to concentrate their studies exclusively on the broad field of peace research and international politics. Due to the existing high level of demand in Germany for well qualified specialists in the field of peace and conflict studies – not least because of recent developments in world politics, as well as an evident staffing shortage in the area of civilian peace services – the employment prospects of those who complete the graduate degrees described below are estimated generally to be extremely high.

2. Content

A series of important outline conditions for the introduction of undergraduate and graduate degree courses was laid down in the university skeleton law and report from the Standing Conference of

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Leader | 1 |
| Research Grants and Awards | 6 |
| Peace Research Institutions and Projects | 6 |
| • Heidelberger Institut für Internationale Konfliktforschung - HIKK | 6 |
| • Graduate Programmes at the United Nations' University of Peace | 7 |
| Conference Reports | 9 |
| Notices and Reports | 24 |
| German Peace Research Publications in English | 28 |
| New Literature in the AFB Reference Library | 29 |
| Meeting and Events 2004 | 31 |

Insert: Index of Peace Research Institutes

¹The following information has largely been taken from the web sites of the relevant institutions. ²Translator's note: Civil servant/public sector employee grade under the German system. ³Prof. Dr. Hans Joachim Gießmann, chair of the Joint Committee and Director of Studies, published the report on the first evaluation of the post-graduate Master of Peace and Security Studies course on the institute's web site on 26 May 2003. ⁴See also: www.uni-tuebingen.de/luni/spi/studmafip.htm#p1. ⁵See also: Rittberger, Volker: Herausforderungen für die Friedensforschung am Beginn des 21. Jahrhunderts - Die Nischenexistenz der Friedensforschung in der deutschen Wissenschafts- und Hochschullandschaft. www.friedens-warte.de/hefte/ritt_203.pdf.

Ministers of Education and Cultural Affairs on strengthening international competitiveness of German places of study of 24 October 1997. An important feature of the corresponding undergraduate and graduate degree courses is quite generally their modularity, i.e. achievement measured by means of examinations throughout the course and the awarding of performance points. This is intended to guarantee a calculable accumulation and easy transfer of examination and study performance and make it possible to tailor the study course individually while maintaining the same use of capacities.

In the context of peace studies the basic principles module should give an introduction to the basic issues in peace research, as well as covering its methods, problem areas and theories and teaching about the essential features of world politics. Furthermore the basic principles module should give an insight into the ethics of politics, in particular those of international relations, and not least approach peace as a guiding principle for professional and especially academic work. The (compulsory) optional module should cover the whole spectrum of topics relating to peace studies as broadly as possible and offer students a variety of options to choose from. The (compulsory) optional modules include foreign policy analysis, examination of international institutions, issues of war and peace, and development and under-development. The seminars and lectures offered should therefore give a sound insight into different areas of international politics from the perspective of peace studies.

This innovative concept of the Master in Peace and Conflict Studies is an attempt to open up to students access to different theoretical and methodological approaches in peace studies within an interdisciplinary teaching and learning en-

vironment on the one hand, and on the other nonetheless to make them better acquainted with the concrete translation of peace policy theories into practice. Teaching therefore aims to maintain a close connection between theory and practice. In this way, the sponsorship is aimed simultaneously at the education of young academics but also at professional fields outside universities.

Qualifications gained by completing the Master's degree courses can generally be classified as internationally compatible, since the content and didactic conception is orientated along current international trends, and the teaching will largely be carried out in English. Great importance is attached to making the courses as international as possible, and it is therefore generally planned to phase out the proportion of teaching conducted in languages other than English over time.

3. The individual programmes

With the Deutsche Stiftung Friedensforschung (DSF, German Foundation for Peace Research) founded in 2000, academia and politics in Germany now have for the first time since the closing down of the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Friedens- und Konfliktforschung (DGFK, disbanded 1982-1984) a "tool" for sponsoring up-and-coming academics in peace studies in a focused way. The DSF is pursuing the goal of permanently improving educational opportunities for young academics in Germany and reducing existing deficits. It must be said that the DSF's funding capital for this area, with a total financial volume of some 5 million euros, is still very small at the moment, with the result that institutions are only able to fulfil their task of reinforcing structures for peace studies in a limited way.

The Master's courses at the University of Tübingen (Peace Studies and International Politics), the Fernuniversität Hagen (Master in Peace Studies) and at the Zentrum für Konfliktforschung at the University of Marburg (Master in Peace and Conflict Studies) are distinguished by a variety of emphases and all represent very advanced study projects, supported by the DSF with a five-year start-up sponsorship in the form of staff and materials. In order to guarantee appropriate staffing for the courses, the foundation is financing lecturerships – alternatively advertised as junior or C3² chairs - from funds for sponsoring excellency. Furthermore, since October 2002 the DSF has been sponsoring the one-year post-graduate Master's degree course (P.MA) in Peace Research and Security Policy at the University of Hamburg, backed by the Kooperationsverband Deutscher Friedensforschungsinstitute. The advantage of the new Master's degree courses lies in the fact that students have the possibility of gaining and assimilating practical experience while still on the course. Thus the post-graduate courses can be described as practically orientated in two senses: on the one hand, peace research is viewed as a science that chooses its topics from practice (reality) according to problem areas and works for practice (to change reality). On the other hand, the courses view themselves largely as being part of practice and understand studying as "learning by doing". In accordance with this double requirement the courses should be studied in close cooperation with a series of institutions working (primarily) in the practical field.

3.1 Hamburg

The one-year Master's course (P.MA) at Hamburg is designed to be cross- and interdisciplinary as well as practically orientated. It sees itself as a combination of



AFB-INFO

Informationen der Arbeitsstelle Friedensforschung Bonn (AFB)/
Newsletter of the Peace Research Information Unit Bonn is produced by the
Außenstelle der Hessischen Stiftung Friedens- und Konfliktforschung (HSFK)/
Branch Office of the Peace Research Institute Frankfurt (PRIF).
Staff: Dr. Regine Mehl and Dominic Raphael Schwickert (editorial),
Anna Wälder (research index), Ute Mennen (mailing list).

Deadline for contributions to the spring issue is **28 February**, and to the autumn issue is **31 August**.

The AFB reserves the right to edit any material submitted. Readers are advised that data on subscribers is stored for mailing purposes. English translation by: Katharine Hughes (Canterbury); layout by: LithoFactory, Joachimstr. 7, 53113 Bonn, www.lithofactory.de; jacket design by: David Hollstein, Kommunikationsdesign, Umlandstr. 34, 76275 Ettlingen, www.hollstein-design.de; printed by: Eberwein, Bonner Str. 101, 53173 Bonn, www.druckerei-eberwein.de, ISSN 0930-8199. Free subscription available on request from the AFB offices at: Geschäftsstelle der AFB, Beethovenallee 4, 53173 Bonn (Bad Godesberg), Germany, Tel.: +49-228-356032, Fax: +49-228-3670339, email: afb@priub.org, www.priub.org. Reproduction permitted; please supply copies for reference. The AFB-INFO is posted on the AFB web site and can be downloaded in pdf format.

AFB Peace Research Database www.priub.org/peace_research_index.html

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Contents: | 303 institutions and individual academic researchers from all fields of peace and conflict research worldwide. |
| Expansion/Updating: | Continuous updating of existing data. |
| Organization: | Database can be searched using keywords or full text, by region and main content subject areas. |
| Access: | Interactive online questionnaire enables users to be included directly on the database. |
| Contact: | Anna Wälde, Arbeitsstelle Friedensforschung Bonn, Beethovenallee 4, 53173 Bonn, Germany, Tel.: +49-228-356032, Fax: +49-228-3670339, email: waelde@priub.org , www.priub.org . |

knowledge acquisition and practical exercises in the fields of peace research and security policy ("learning by doing"). Applications for this course may be submitted between 1 January and the following 30 April of any calendar year, with places on the course being limited. The Joint Committee of the course also awards, in collaboration with the Kooperationsverband Friedensforschung und Sicherheitspolitik, a limited number of grants from funding by the DSF and the Deutscher Akademischer Auslandsdienst (DAAD, German Academic Exchange Service). Decisions about admissions and grants are made by the Joint Committees of the University of Hamburg and the Institut für Friedensforschung und Sicherheitspolitik at the University of Hamburg (IFSH).

The objective of the course is to provide a challenging introduction to issues relating to peace and security policy and the basic principles of how these should be addressed in practice for highly qualified graduates from the humanities or sciences at a German or foreign university or college of further education as well as academically trained, experienced practitioners in the field of peace policy. The course is also concerned with teaching about peace research methods and results, and in so doing preparing the Master's students for working as researchers and teachers in peace studies or in a professional field role (e.g. peace-keeping, monitoring, verification, development aid, mediation, arbitration, conversion, administration) for a national or international organization, administration, association or business enterprise.

A great advantage of this course is that the university works in cooperation with proven academic institutions specializing in peace research and analysis of security policy in Germany. Besides the focused passing-on of accumulated expertise to the students by these institutions through teaching and practically-orientated research, this cooperation simultaneously serves to form a closer link between teaching and research at peace research institutions in Germany and therefore exploits the effects of synergy by working together.

The course, like all graduate programmes, is modular in structure. The first semester is devoted to teaching the fundamentals with compulsory optional lectures, consolidation seminars, intensive courses and optional supplementary courses. In the second semester, the main emphasis is on practical units. This includes compulsory participation in research projects and in cross-sectional tasks at an academic institution involved in the P.MA, optional interviews at national and

international institutions orientated towards professional fieldwork, completion of the Master's dissertation, and a mid-term and final colloquium. The course ends with the awarding of the academic title of Master of Peace and Security Policy Studies (M.P.S.).

An evaluation³ of this course was carried out with the participation of all the students and most lecturers for the first semester of the first academic year (2002/2003) during the period February–April 2003. The interdisciplinary structure and modular nature of the course were judged by students and lecturers alike to be useful and beneficial. The involvement of teachers from "Residenzinstituten" and external consultants from the field, as well as the bringing together of students from different academic backgrounds and with different experience was also felt to be very enriching. The topical density and challenging level of some teaching were judged to be very high in view of the relatively short time allotted, especially with regard to expected achievement. The didactic quality was judged by all the students as high.

3.2 Tübingen

The course at Tübingen is a two-year course (students must complete their studies in this period), in which achievement is measured for the most part continually during the course through earning marked certificates with points for achievement. The Tübingen study programme includes lectures on political sciences and also topically relevant teaching from other disciplines (psychology, philosophy, law, economics, ethnology, cultural studies etc). The programme is divided into different modules, among which the modules on "basic principles of analysis of international politics from the perspective of peace research" and "analysis of central conflicts in international politics and their management" are compulsory. In addition to these, two further module options must

be completed, from a choice covering world order issues and international government, the issue of war and peace, Europe and global protagonists, as well as studying violent conflicts in regions outside Europe.

The programme also includes the option of participating in a simulation project on the working methods of the United Nations, linked with a study trip to New York and excursions to Vienna, Strasbourg and Brussels to visit international organizations concerned with European security issues. A seminar on negotiation and mediation is also offered, which includes the simulation of a negotiation project over several days. On successful completion of this course, following a single oral examination and successfully submitted Master's dissertation, the faculty of social and behavioural sciences at the University of Tübingen awards the academic title of Master of Arts in Peace Research and International Politics. In the course protocol, it is stated in § 1 that the Master's degree establishes ability to produce academic work and familiarity with the basic theories and methods and essential findings of peace and conflict research on developments and issues in international and transnational politics⁴.

3.3 Marburg

With its Master of Peace and Conflict Studies study programme, Marburg university is building on seven years' experience in running a subsidiary course of studies in peace and conflict research, giving it a proven institutional, structural, personnel and didactic framework. The subsidiary course of studies in peace and conflict research at the Phillips-Universität Marburg made this until recently the only university where peace and conflict research could be studied in person, although the course far exceeded its brief in terms of scope, content and methodology.

The graduate course in Peace and Conflict Studies aims to qualify students to be able to research and analyse political conflicts in a national and international context. However this analytical dimension is accompanied by a voluntarist one, namely that graduates from this course should be in a position to elaborate possible ways of resolving conflicts and be able to participate in resolving conflicts (i.e. mediation) themselves. The course aims to teach a sound basic knowledge of the central areas of peace and conflict research, analytical competence in the systematic investigation of conflicts according to type, causes and resolution of the conflict, and research competence in the use of socio-scientific methods and theories in empirical conflict situations in an interdisciplinary national and international context. In addition to this it should improve each individual student's media, communication and organizational skills as well as social and intercultural skills.

The course of study in the first semester of the Master's programme has as its definite objective first of all to give an in-

roduction to peace and conflict research, socio-scientific conflict theories and forms of conflict resolution. The knowledge gained of the specialist subject should then be applied during the second semester by interpreting and analysing relevant political conflict situations. This systematic study of conflicts according to specified characteristics should also include economic, political, cultural and ecological dimensions of conflicts, with the result that conflicts with a variety of different structures should form the central focus of the second semester. The teaching of the first year of study, largely relating to problems, will be supplemented by two foundation courses (International Law, International Relations or Conflict Resolution).

So that the course does not amount merely to reaching an analytical understanding of conflict structures, conflicts are interpreted by students themselves in the third semester by means of individual research in interdisciplinary research seminars. The practical element of the course consists of compulsory practical

placements during periods free of lecture courses and the involvement of experts for example from the OSCE or NGOs. The fourth semester is taken up with the examination component, when the Master's dissertation must be completed and study content reviewed in oral examinations.

A key criterion for admission to the course is a first degree in social sciences, with knowledge and competence in empirical social research being crucial. The 30 places on the course will be allocated in each winter semester 100% according to qualification criteria, which will be assessed *inter alia* at selection interview.

Overall control of the interdisciplinary teaching outside the specialist area of peace and conflict research at the University of Marburg lies in the hands of the faculty of Social Sciences and Philosophy. A total of some 50 academics from 16 disciplines are currently working at the centre for conflict research in Marburg, and research is focused on six main areas at the moment: everyday violence;

AFB-Texte Series (in chronological order)

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

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

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

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

Thomas Dominikowski, Frieden lehren?! Über Friedenslehre und Curricula der Friedenswissenschaft an Hochschulen, February 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, October 1994, 13 S.

Martina Fischer, Entmilitarisierung durch Streitkräftereform? Trends zu Freiwilligenarmeen und zur Einbindung von Frauen ins Militär, May 1997, 28 S.

Birgit Brock-Utne, Multicultural Education and Development: Similarities with, and Challenges to, Peace Education, March 1998, 18 S.

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

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

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

Cordula Reimann, The Field of Conflict Management: Why does Gender Matter? October 1999, 23 S.

Cordula Reimann, Konfliktbearbeitung in Theorie und Praxis: Spielt „Gender“ eine Rolle? March 2000, 29 S.

Tobias Debiel/Volker Matthies, Krisenprävention: Was wurde erreicht? Eine Bestandsaufnahme zur deutschen Entwicklungs-, Außen- und Sicherheitspolitik, September 2000, 22 S.

Elkhan Nuriyev, The Post-Soviet Caucasus Within New Geopolitical Framework: Towards Conflict or Peace? November 2000, 27 S.

Christian Büttner, Friedens- und Konfliktforschung und Interdisziplinarität: Eine historische Skizze zur Entwicklung pädagogisch-psychologischer Friedens- und Konfliktforschung an der HSFK, June 2001, 22 S.

Randall Caroline Forsberg, Gesellschaftlich sanktionierte und nicht-sanktionierte Gewalt – Die Bedeutung sozialer Normen bei der Entstehung und Prävention von Krieg, January 2002, 39 S.

Gunter Schubert, Der Kosovokrieg und das Projekt des Rechtspazifismus – Eine vorläufige Bilanz der Debatte, February 2002, 20 S.

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

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

Authors' names printed in bold: these publications can be printed in pdf format from our web site.

domestic and foreign security; ecological conflict sites; reproductive medicine; conflict theories in the social sciences; and forms of conflict resolution. In a very intensive assessment procedure the Deutsche Stiftung Friedensforschung (DSF) drew particular attention to the didactic preparation of the course content, the integrative concept of interdisciplinarity, the practical components and the breadth of specialization of the teaching staff in the Marburg Master's programme.

3.4 Hagen

The modular correspondence course at the University of Hagen will span three years. An introductory seminar which is not part of the modules must be completed along with modules 1 and 2 in the first year of study. It is an interdisciplinary outline of ways of looking at problems in peace policy. It also aims to discuss the issue of the relation between theory and practice that exists in peace studies and present relevant working methods for the discipline. Module 1 is a classic and systematic introduction to the topic, which helps students reflect on academic theoretical principles and gain analytical competence. It aims to give an initial overview of the broad field of peace and conflict research and present Galtung's peace and development theory in particular. Module 2 deals with theories on violent conflicts and examines conflict structures on personal, cultural and social levels.

After successful completion of modules 1 and 2 students move on to module 3 in their second year of study, which aims to elucidate current issues to do with peace and its interdisciplinary theoretical study. Among other things, this includes topics such as media construction processes, globalization processes, processes of violence formation between people, and scientific aspects of peace, such as disarmament issues. Module 4 covers kinds of non-violent conflict resolution, models of preventive conflict transformation and peace policy tools for de-escalating conflicts. In the third and final year of study, after successful completion of a practical component, the programme covers specific methods and processes of conflict management. This aims to encourage students to reflect upon practical experience, work through case studies and improve their communicative skills. Module 6 runs through all three years of the course, covering the topic Organizations and Administrative Action. This aims to link organizational theories with the students' relevant practical experience in peace studies.

After successful completion of modules 1-5, students consolidate their knowledge of the subject matter in the final module and apply the methodologies they have learned to problems. All students have to produce a Master's dissertation and undergo an oral examination, upon successful completion of which they are accepted as a Master of Peace Studies. Subject matter and methodology are taught during the course by submission of written work by students, attendance at residential seminars and courses on the Internet. Student performance is evaluated through homework, written assignments and internet workgroups.

3.5 Magdeburg

Like the University of Tübingen the University of Magdeburg awards the Master of Arts in Peace and Conflict Research after successful completion of the study course and a satisfactory Master's dissertation. According to their documentation, places are offered to graduates in any discipline having completed an undergraduate or post-graduate (Master's, PhD) course, who also have good knowledge of English and an interest in pursuing a career in an international institution or NGO.

The aim of the course is to teach the theories and methods of peace and conflict research. With a view to this, skills are fostered in analysing social and political connections with a broad perspective. The main focuses of the course are equally on approaches that either enquire into the causes of violent conflicts and options for their transformation, or seek existing experiences of a peaceful co-existence and chances of stabilization and spread of non-violent mechanisms for dealing with conflict. Course content therefore includes, in addition to theories and methodology of peace and conflict research: international law and human rights policy, examination of historic and current case studies and study of the working methods of international institutions and NGOs. Practical seminars are held so that students can learn conflict mediation methods and simulate negotiation and decision-making processes.

4. Outlook

Just why should so much importance and attention be accorded these new courses? Why is AFB-INFO devoting an entire editorial to this topic instead of merely publishing an announcement with contact details? The answer is supplied by Prof. Rittberger, president of the DSF: peace research as research without teaching and without any long-term continuous sponsorship of up-and-coming academics would in his opinion see itself

done out of its future, as illustrated by the rise and fall of the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Friedens- und Konfliktforschung (DGFK)⁵. This institution for peace studies founded in the early 1970s at the instigation of the then president of the German Federal Republic Gustav Heinemann and the social-liberal government was unable to put down any long-term roots at federal level due to a lack of cross-party political-scientific consensus. According to Rittberger the tender seedling that was peace research was starved of water before its budding stems could put down roots. Although thinking about peace policy has been deeply embedded in the collective German psyche since the end of the Second World War – Rittberger continues – German peace research has been demoted to a niche academic discipline and pushed into a position on the academic sidelines.

However it is precisely the most recent developments in the field of international politics, from the war in Yugoslavia, to 11 September 2001, to the Afghanistan and Iraq campaigns, that illustrate the necessity of researching the causes of war and providing alternative concepts of peace at the beginning of the new century. In view of its complexity, justice can only be done to this task – indeed responsibility – so important to social policy in the form of a materially strong peace research and teaching institutionalized through concrete programmes at universities which also bear sponsorship of up-and-coming academics in mind.

Rittberger considers peace research to be particularly challenged by recent events when considering old and new issues impartially. It is one of the central functions of peace research to give critical consideration based on sound methodological and theoretical pure research to concepts, institutions and strategies for prevention of violence and for peaceful conflict management, also to devise new ideas and develop research further. As such, peace research represents a value-based science aiming to show the protagonists in conflicts that endanger their peaceful co-existence non-violent methods of conflict management, using appropriate models and strategies.

It should be the main goal of all those responsible for academic policy in Germany in the face of the role of the Federal Republic of Germany's peace policy on the international stage, to free peace studies from their niche existence by means of material support in particular, improve the infrastructure of peace studies in research and teaching and promote civil peace specialists. The new graduate study programmes project, which will further anchor peace research and teaching at German universities and therefore recruit qualified up-and-coming academics in the field, in

this respect and in view of Germany's increasing responsibilities in world politics is a step that points the way towards a peace research in Germany that can hold its own competitively and give a strong performance on the international stage.

Linked with this initiative is the chance of giving lasting encouragement to the cooperation between university and non-university institutions, which has intensified in recent years but which is still far from adequate, and thus between teaching, research and politics in the field of security and peace policy issues. This long-overdue institutionalization of cross-discipline peace research at German universities gives rise to the hope that international politics will change its academic understanding of the peace policy paradigm.

*Dominic Raphael Schwickert,
University of Münster*

Contacts: Institut für Friedensforschung und Sicherheitspolitik an der Universität Hamburg (IFSH), Falkenstein 1, 22587 Hamburg, Germany, Tel.: +49-40-866-077-0, Fax: +49-40-866-3615, email: info.MPS@uni-hamburg.de www.ifsh.de/studium/studium.php

Institut für Politikwissenschaft der Universität Tübingen, Abteilung Internationale Beziehungen/ Friedens- und Konfliktforschung, Melancthonstr. 36, 72074 Tübingen, Germany, Tel.: +49-7071-297-8372, Fax: +49-7071-292-417, email: ifp.ircenter@uni-tuebingen.de, email archive: ifp.irarchive@uni-tuebingen.de, www.uni-tuebingen.de/uni/spi/ab2mitar.htm

Philipps-Universität Marburg, Zentrum für Konfliktforschung, Ketzerbach 11, 35032 Marburg/Lahn, Germany, Tel.: +49-6421-2824-598 or: +49-6421-2824-580, Fax: +49-6421-2828-978, email: konflikt@staff.uni-marburg.de, www.uni-marburg.de/konfliktforschung/index.html

FernUniversität Hagen – GH Institut Frieden und Demokratie, Im Dünningbruch 9, Postfach 940, 58084 Hagen, Germany, Tel.: +49-2331-9872-365, Fax: +49-2331-9874-797, email: Ingrid.Bussler@FernUni-Hagen.de, www.fernuni-hagen.de/FRIEDEN

Otto-von-Guericke-Universität Magdeburg, Institut für Politikwissenschaft, Zschokkestr.32, 39016 Magdeburg, Germany, Tel.: +49-39167-16673, email: joerg.meyer@gse-w.uni-magdeburg.de, www.uni-magdeburg.de/k3/FK-Forschung.shtml

Research Grants and Awards

Projektverbund Friedens- und Konfliktforschung in Lower Saxony

The Projektverbund Friedens- und Konfliktforschung in Lower Saxony ended in 2003 after ten years' activity. This association was founded on the initiative of the regional government of Lower Saxony in Osnabrück in 1993 with an initial period of funding of five years. In the end, its life was extended for a further five years, which is quite unusual for an association of this type and must be due to the persuasive results from its initial period of funding. Thus in 1998 a further five years' sponsorship was granted to it by the government of Lower Saxony using funds advanced to Lower Saxony by the Volkswagen Foundation. This brought the Projektverbund's total funding over the ten years to some seven million euros.

During this time 32 research projects were funded. Both academic directors and the academic advisory council initiated and coordinated research activities in different academic disciplines on peace-related issues. The main focus of content ranged from emigration, violence in the social arena and in war, legitimation of violence, ethnic, religious and gender-specific conflicts, to the role of the media and options for non-violent intervention in armed disputes. The value of such a research project lies principally in making a platform for discussion available in which academics from various specialist fields and schools of research can exchange views.

Besides project activities, the association also specifically sponsored up-and-coming academics and organised regular events for a broad specialist public. Particularly worth a mention is the association's successful intervention for the foundation of the Deutsche Stiftung Friedensforschung (DSF, German Foundation for Peace Research) as a federal foundation. The Projektverbund Friedens- und Konfliktforschung can be called a successful example of regional and national research sponsorship. It gave the status of peace studies in the German academic landscape a lasting boost, and in so doing enabled academics in the field of peace studies to form a stronger network.

Contact: Projektverbund Friedens- und Konfliktforschung in Niedersachsen, c/o Prof. Dr. Günter Bierbrauer/Michael Jaeger, Universität Osnabrück, Fachbereich Psychologie und Gesundheitswissenschaften, Seminarstraße 20, 49069 Osnabrück, Germany, Tel.: +49-541-969-4803, Fax: +49-541-969-4763, email: pfk.nds@uos.de, www.pfk.uni-osnabrueck.de

Peace Research Institutions and Projects

Heidelberger Institut für Internationale Konfliktforschung - HIIK

Since early 2004 up-and-coming academics at Heidelberg have been on the trail of global refugee dynamics for the EU Commission. The project, entitled "Humanitarian Impact of Conflict Dynamics", is being carried out at the Institute of Political Science at the University of Heidelberg for the European Commission Humanitarian Office (ECHO). Its objective is to look into the effects of conflict dynamics on forming crowds of refugees and how these develop, using the KOSIMO conflict database (Konflikt Simulations MOdell).

A cornerstone of this project is the KOSIMO 2.0 conflict database, developed at the Heidelberger Institut für Internationale Konfliktforschung (HIIK) e.V. from 2002 to 2004. At the heart of the methodology stands the dynamic conflict model, which incorporates five intensities in its improved version, taking into account the phases of non-violent and violent conflict ranging from latent conflict to war.

The HIIK emerged from the KOSIMO conflict data project, which was initiated at the Institute for Political Science at the University of Heidelberg in 1987. It works on researching, assessing and documenting domestic and international political conflicts. The quality of research is guaranteed by 30 to 40 permanent employees.

The HIIK is dedicated to two kinds of task: one is the maintenance and development of the database which currently has 540 basis conflicts from the period between 1945 and 2003, subdivided into over 2,500 intensities. Depending on the number of parties to the conflict involved, each conflict is coded with at least 30 variables. With the introduction of KOSIMO 2.0, methodologically and technically more advanced than the existing KOSIMO file, the non-violent phases of conflicts are now documented in greater detail. A new feature represents the inclusion of structural data for non-governmental agents and of processes at the level of the sequence of events of a conflict. On this basis, the HIIK together with the Austrian Institute for Artificial Intelligence (ÖFAI) in Vienna developed a programme for early crisis detection for ECHO within the framework of the research project entitled "Early Detection of Man-Made Crises" which ran until December 2003. Since January 2004,

data on refugee movements have been integrated into KOSIMO 2.0 as part of the new research project "Humanitarian Impact of Conflict Dynamics". The aim is to identify the times of larger refugee movements by comparing refugee data and the conflict dynamics stored in KOSIMO. The results will be presented to ECHO as early as December 2004.

The second main focus of the institute's work is the annually produced Conflict Barometer. This publication in English and German analyses conflicts observed over the course of one year. The Conflict Barometer reproduces the annual balance sheet for global conflicts. The publication is divided into five world regions and cites all current conflicts in detailed tables and brief descriptive text extracts. It also gives the global trends in state conflict behaviour and conflict resolution measures implemented during the year in question. Putsches, attempted putsches, acts of international terrorism and conflict management measures taken are also summarized.

Its many years' experience in the academic study of conflicts have given the HIIK one of the most comprehensive conflict databases in the world. The most recent version of KOSIMO Version 2.0 is a successful application-orientated linking of knowledge from empirical conflict research with the demands of institutions that advise on policy. The "Early Detection of Man-made Crises" project now ending supplies the foundation for searching for refugee dynamics of the project on "Humanitarian Impact of Conflict Dynamics" recently begun for ECHO.

Contact: Nicolas Schwank, M.A. (President), Heidelberger Institut für Internationale Konfliktforschung am Institut für Politische Wissenschaft der Universität Heidelberg, Marstallstraße 6, 69117 Heidelberg, Germany, Tel.: +49-6221-543198, Fax: +49-6221-542896, email: info@hiik.de, www.hiik.de

Graduate Programmes at the United Nations' University of Peace

Various new graduate programmes are being offered by the University of Peace in San José (Costa Rica). These programmes, held in English, focus on the topics of International Law, United Nations, Peace and Conflict Research and Security Policy in the broadest sense (human security and environmental security). The admission requirement for all programmes is a first degree or equivalent qualification.

The Graduate Programme in International Law and Human Rights is a joint project between the University of Peace and the Raoul Wallenberg Institute at the University of Lund (Sweden), along with the Max Planck Institute for Comparative Public Law and International Law at the University of Heidelberg and other institutions in Costa Rica, Thailand and South Africa. This programme offers two different qualifications: Master of Arts in International Law and the Settlement of Disputes; and Master of Arts in International Law and Human Rights.

The study plan for both Master's courses consists of a concentrated 10-month residential period of study (two semesters) including 12 course units and a possible 40 academic credits. In the first semester (September-December) students from both programmes are taught core introductory courses in international law, international institutions and human rights together. These common core courses are followed by specialized courses.

The Master's in Settlement of Disputes has as its main focus specialized courses in international relations. It also looks at environmental and economic issues that might give rise to conflict and which play a role in the context of international relations.

The Master's in Human Rights deals with formal (international law treaties) and informal (the involvement of non-governmental organizations) mechanisms for implementing human rights and also covers religions, regional idiosyncracies and business aspects. The course aim is to create understanding of the challenges facing peace policy-makers in the 21st century and familiarize the students with the theoretical and methodological options available for peace and conflict research. It also aims to develop ethical awareness and critical thinking as well as practical skills in preventive diplomacy, peace consolidation and peace-making. An essential element of all graduate programmes is the Independent Studies component, composed of an independently researched and written Master's thesis, preceded by an introductory course in qualitative and quantitative academic research methods.

The Master of Arts in Gender and Peace Building course is a 10-month programme addressed at men and women and focusing on key issues of gender and peace building. The objective of the programme is to introduce students to peace and conflict research while studying the causes, background and effects of conflict, giving special consideration to gender-specific aspects. The course aims to emphasize the significance of gender as an analytical

category for avoiding injustices and inequalities based on gender discrimination. Graduates from this Master's programme should be able to design and implement gender and peace programmes, and evaluate peace research projects concerned with the issue of gender.

The Master's Degree in International Peace Studies is addressed at 20 students from anywhere in the world with an active interest in international peace studies. The course is divided into three semesters. Term 1 covers an introduction to peace studies, and lecture courses on conflict prevention, human rights, democratization, international law and international organizations. There is also a compulsory course on research methods. In Term 2, compulsory (courses in regional studies, disarmament and non-proliferation, international terrorism), elective (a course from the field of gender or peace education) and specialist subjects have to be completed. These latter include conflict management, environmental conservation and economic development. The third and final term from May to August concentrates on the practice of conflict prevention and resolution, human security and urban violence, and the Capstone Synthesis. Students must also complete a thesis.

Another new course at the University of Peace is the 16-month Master's Degree in Environmental Security and Peace, which aims to take into account the increasing competition for natural resources in many regions of the world and the rising importance of environmental security in the 21st century. Besides theory of peace studies and methodology from social sciences, this course will emphasize the implication of environmental factors in the analysis of peace and conflict situations.

Term 1 from August to December consists of lecture courses on peace studies, international law and environmental security. The following Term 2 from January to April aims to consolidate the information given in the introduction of Term 1 and go into issues of demographic change, migration and the political economy in greater detail, as well as studying the status of forests and water. In Term 3 from May to July the focus is on socio-economic aspects such as energy shortage, famine, food and health provision and urban environmental security. The status of science and available environmental technology will be examined in more detail and measures for preventing or resolving environmental conflicts will be elaborated. After a compulsory 6-week period of fieldwork in August, Term 4 from September to December covers stra-

Movement for UN Reform 2007 – UNFOR 2007

Started in summer 2003 by Hamburg peace historian Klaus Schlichtmann, the Movement for UN Reform 2007 (UNFOR 2007) stands for complete global disarmament, democratization of the United Nations and giving the organization the monopoly of power. The movement aims to collect up to 1,000 signatures (until the year 2007, the centenary of the Second Hague Peace Conference) from prominent peace academics and pacifists to use as a basis for political action.

At the heart of the movement's campaign is the question of alternative policies to military solutions to secure peace, and how this may be achieved on the basis of the UN Charter and current international and constitutional law. As peace researcher Dieter S. Lutz ascertained in 1993 in his book "Deutschland und die Kollektive Sicherheit" (Germany and Collective Security), even today this issue is still a taboo. However there is no doubt that the United Nations and also the principles of collective security laid down in the German Constitution (Basic Law, Articles 24-26) have as their ultimate objective a positive peace (security and a just order), in which all states will have disarmed and UN troops will be deployed as a global police force within the framework of a "Weltinnenpolitik" (global domestic policy, Lutz, *ibid.*).

A peace which guarantees security and order and the establishment of an international police force necessary for this purpose (Nico Krisch 2001) remain the unfulfilled promise (Klaus Neumann 2002) on the agenda at the beginning of the 21st century. Not quite as Dieter S. Lutz assumed in 1993 perhaps, the concept of collective security is based on a positive concept of peace: the UN Charter envisages a peace which includes reducing armaments to a 'minimum' under effective international controls (Art. 106 UN Charter) and obligatory international jurisdiction for the peaceful settlement of disputes. Collective security is meant to substitute national defence (N. Krisch), making it obsolete. This concept includes not only the procedures mentioned in article 43 of the UN Charter, but also the provisions in constitutional law ('droit constitutionnel de la paix', B. Mirkin-Guetzévitch 1951), which provide for a transfer or limitation of sovereignty in favour of collective security and international cooperation. In this, regional agreements appear to be of secondary importance. European integration and the reform of the international system must be complementary and progress side by side to avoid security loopholes and prevent a possible breakdown of European integration.

The Movement for UN Reform 2007 (UNFOR 2007) is pursuing a full agenda:

(1) Democratization of the world organization requires the establishment of civilian democratic controls, i.e. a Civil Society Council as a subsidiary organ to the UN General Assembly, with an advisory function, a kind of NGO forum uniting the organizations engaged in peace and environmental activities, which are accredited with the United Nations Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC). Subsidiary organs can be set up by the General Assembly under article 22 of the UN Charter. Its members would represent the interests of the community of nations and

should no longer be committed to their respective nationalities. This is not a new idea: as early as 1919 the German delegation at the Versailles Peace Conference under the leadership of the international jurist Walther Schücking called for the establishment of a law-making "world parliament".

(2) A fundamental prerequisite for the United Nations to function effectively is that the Security Council should be representative, i.e. that an "equitable geographical distribution" of members in the Security Council is guaranteed, as stipulated in the Charter (article 23, UN Charter). The failed attempts to reform the Security Council in the 1990s illustrate that it is unlikely that UN member states will agree upon a common solution, which will in a single step create both a functional world executive/monopoly of power and the basis and democratic conditions necessary for it.

The Movement for UN Reform 2007 (UNFOR 2007) therefore proposes a two-tier plan: in the first stage, for the period of transition (see article 106 of the UN Charter, Transitional Security Arrangements), only minimum changes to the composition of the Security Council and the text of the Charter should be undertaken i.e. the "equitable geographical distribution" of memberships should be brought within compass by appointing a representative from the South as a permanent member. If India were to declare itself prepared to initiate nuclear disarmament, in accordance with article 6 of the Non-proliferation Treaty (NPT), then it might be awarded such a mandate as a regional regulatory power, representing over a billion people.

Ideally, the European countries should agree on a common representation in the first stage, and hand over to the United Nations – with its monopoly of power in the making – a mandate to guarantee European security and order. As soon as an effective system of collective security is clearly emerging, as the founders of the UN had anticipated, Great Britain and France would no longer need their special status (see Art. 106 UN Charter).

After a specified period of time – perhaps after five years – a comprehensive reform should be undertaken in the next stage. During this comprehensive reform, the number of permanent members of the UN Security Council could be raised to nine (with Japan, South America, Africa and the League of Arab States) and that of non-permanent members to fifteen (Schlichtmann 1999). If the arrangements from the first stage have proved satisfactory, the Civil Society Council should be transformed from a secondary to a principal organ under article 7 of the UN Charter, with more extensive capabilities.

The initiative, to push forward these reforms, should come from the Federal Republic of Germany, if it observes and implements the peace provisions in its Basic Law. In this way other countries with similar provisions would be compelled to follow suit, creating a representative, true monopoly of power, democratizing the United Nations, and achieving general and complete disarmament. The Movement for UN Reform 2007 (UNFOR 2007) therefore not only adopts the (positive) concept of collective security from the UN Charter and modern

peace constitutions, but also the aims of the Peace Conferences in The Hague: disarmament and compulsory international jurisdiction.

In concrete terms, UNFOR calls for:

- the launching of general and complete global disarmament on Germany's initiative;
- the passing of a legislative bill in the German parliament, for transferring national sovereignty rights in accordance with article 24 section 1 of the Basic Law, in which the Federal Republic rejects all military solutions to peacekeeping and declares its support for the principle that disputes between states should in future be settled using civilian means in accordance with the rule of law;
- the explication of the powers of the Security Council in the proposed law or bill. This demand is central to the movement, aiming to implement a feasible plan for global disarmament based on a fresh understanding of collective security. This requires a true global monopoly of power to evolve, which must lie with the United Nations;
- the commitment by Germany to the creation of a democratic assembly as a law-making body (world parliament), as proposed by the German peace delegation at Versailles in 1919. This subsidiary organ should consist of representative NGOs (CAMDUN, NGO Forum, World Social Forum) and lead up to the foundation of a Civil Society Council as one of the seven principal organs of the United Nations;
- the immediate commitment by Germany to a permanent representation from the southern hemisphere on the UN Security Council.

The Movement for UN Reform 2007 (UNFOR 2007) calls upon peace academics to actively support the Basic Law initiative along these lines by putting their signatures to it. To date the UN Charter and 'peace constitutions' contain simply a declaration of intent, which need to be translated into action. The plan can only succeed with the support of a substantial proportion of the peace academic community and only with pressure from public opinion and democratic action groups.

Further petition actions are planned, and a joint declaration should follow with the publication of the signatures either at the beginning of May (3 May: Anniversary of the Japanese Constitution) and on Hiroshima Day (6 August), each year until 2007.

Detailed, up-to-date information on UNFOR 2007 as well as documentation and background information is available online at: <http://www.ne.jp/asahi/peace/unitednationsreform2007>. An information dossier can also be requested.

Klaus Schlichtmann

Contact: Dr. Klaus Schlichtmann, Nakayama 452-35, Hidaka-shi, Saitama-ken, 350-1232 Japan, Tel. and Fax: +81-429-892966 – email: Friedenspolitik@hotmail.com, UNReform2007@netscape.net, www.ne.jp/asahi/peace/unitednationsreform2007

tegies for advancing environmental security as well as an analysis of the Capstone Synthesis, followed by completion of the Master's thesis.

In addition to the courses described above, a Master's Degree in Peace Education will also be available from this year. This course is devoted to the complex requirements of education in peace-making and peace building in societies that are often divided. Graduates from this programme should be able to build an exemplary educational framework for peace taking local capacities into consideration in a given country, making a lasting and sustainable peace process possible. The task should be possible on the basis of a broad knowledge of basic concepts and skills within the multidisciplinary areas that make up peace and conflict studies, as well as based on specific knowledge of the social and cultural environment of the society in question.

Term 1 (September to December) includes introductory seminars in peace studies, peace education (theory and practice), human rights and general research methods. Term 2 from January to April concentrates in particular on peace education. The lecture courses on offer cover the psychology of violence and peace, issues of educational strategy and educational change, and peace education workshops. Term 3 from May to August covers specifically an analysis of the connection between language, media and conflicts, as well as concrete didactic ideas for overcoming conflicts.

Contact: Office of the Dean for Academic Administration, University for Peace Apdo, 138-6100 Ciudad Colon, Costa Rica, Tel.: +506-205-9000, Fax: +506-249-1324, email: acadmin@upeace.org, www.upeace.org/academic

Dual Masters Degree in Natural Resources and Sustainable Development in Washington D.C. and San José

A partnership between the American University's School of International Service in Washington D.C. (USA) and the University for Peace in San José (Costa Rica) has set up the two-year dual Master's degree in Natural Resources and Sustainable Development. This multidisciplinary programme aims to familiarize students with the challenges of the 21st century, such as growing world population, limited resources and unequal distribution of wealth in the world economy. Graduates from this programme should

be qualified to comprehend and resolve environmental conflicts with the aid of analytical methods and taking into consideration social, economic and environmental dimensions. On completing the course, graduates should be capable of providing well founded political advice on highly complex issues of international environmental policy.

The American University will offer specialist lecture courses in the areas of international relations, environmental policy and economics, while the University of Peace will concentrate on seminars on sustainable development, peace studies and natural resource management. Students enrolled on the course will spend their first and fourth semester in Washington D.C. and the second and third in Costa Rica. A professional internship in applied practical work must be completed after the second semester.

Contacts: School of International Service American University, 4400 Massachusetts Avenue, NW Washington, D.C., USA, 20016-8071, Tel.: +1-202-885-1617, Fax: +1-202-885-2494, email: sisunup@american.edu.

Office of the Dean for Academic Administration, University for Peace Apdo, 138-6100 Ciudad Colon, Costa Rica, Tel.: +506-205-9000, Fax: +506-249-1324, email: acadmin@upeace.org, www.upeace.org/academic

In his introductory lecture on Friday evening, entitled "Schweigen – Dialog führen – Intervenieren? Bedingungen des Handelns im Konfliktfall" (Keep quiet – start a dialogue – intervene? How to behave in cases of conflict), Günter E. Thie (Aachen), advisor on peace and civil conflict management at Misereor for a set period, illustrated the balancing act in which human rights, development cooperation and civil conflict management have to operate together. The principles governing the respective actions of each sphere of activity led to some dilemmas: action is governed by the concept of development in development cooperation; by non-violence in civil conflict management; and by justice in human rights protection.

In western understanding of human rights, these rights are taken as a matter of course to be universal, indivisible and non-negotiable. They have no hierarchy and frequently form the basis of an individual legal right. Human rights protection generally addresses the public: from enlightening people through lobbying and advocacy to compensating victims.

Development cooperation follows the model of peace, justice and – in so far as it is motivated by Christian principles – preservation of God's creation. The governing principles of development cooperation include enforcing fundamental rights or satisfying basic needs, removing sources of violence, encouraging participation and combatting poverty.

Civil conflict management gives priority first and foremost to the non-military, non-violent transformation of violent conflicts. It strives towards using commensurate means and creating lasting structures for civilian society. As a standard it is guided by human rights and pursues an inclusive approach that includes all parties in the conflict.

When civilian organizations working in these fields encounter one another on the ground, a number of real dilemmas and apparent contradictions arise from their working together. While human rights protection specifically seeks the public out for its concern, civil conflict management needs discretion; the inclusive approach of civil conflict management appears to legitimize the perpetrators of violence and therefore grates against the understanding of human rights, which would prefer to see human rights abuses publicized and condemned; human rights protection has no criteria for establishing priorities, whereas in development cooperation limited resources make it essential to identify a main point of focus.

Conference Reports

"Peace without Justice? In the balancing act between human rights protection, development cooperation and civil conflict management"

Conference held 10-12 October 2003 at the Ev. Akademie Bad Boll, in collaboration with Forum Menschenrechte, Plattform Zivile Konfliktbearbeitung and Brot für die Welt.

Non-government organizations (NGOs) from the fields of human rights protection, development cooperation and civil conflict management are active in a variety of ways in the same areas of crisis and conflict. By mutually acknowledging differences in practical approaches, the way should be paved towards better cooperation between these three fields of activity.

This pointed out that there were no compulsory minimum standards for those working in a conflict region. As possible prerequisites for successful work together he proposed among other things joint and direct action against threatened or actual violence, a clear definition of the roles of those working in the region, knowledge of all relevant interests, and a "safe area" for negotiations.

The following discussion mentioned humanitarian organizations as a fourth group of protagonists, who were often deployed at a very early stage and without whom the picture outlined by Thie was not complete.

On Saturday morning the conference theme was elaborated in more depth in three papers on the respective spheres of activity. Martina Fischer (Berghof Forschungszentrum für konstruktive Konfliktbearbeitung Berlin) listed several challenges for the activities of human rights protection, development cooperation and civil conflict management. First of all she picked out the issue of dealing with the past, particularly in societies destroyed by war. Peace-building measures were pointless as long as the perpetrators of violence were able to carry on their lives as before. The various NGOs were all agreed upon this, but each tackled this problem in a different way: human rights strove to bring the perpetrators to justice before a criminal court; civil conflict management attempted to involve as many people/groups as possible in their work, even the perpetrators (e.g. soldiers). In this way the accepted pattern of perpetrators and victims fell apart, as e.g. soldiers were often both perpetrators and victims at the same time.

A second point of consideration related to the demand for peace agreements to be implemented and how they really were implemented, where a big issue was the frequently considerable delay in repatriation and reintegration of refugees.

"No peace without social justice!" For development cooperation this incontrovertible conviction means that in supporting the needy it must not permit any new asymmetries to come into existence, and for civil conflict management it means that the needy must not be forgotten when including all relevant groups in the conflict management process. In conclusion Fischer mentioned the conditional relation between war and poverty and proposed as a shared challenge the objective of giving people real economic prospects and psychological support.

Barbara Lochbihler (Secretary-General of the German section of amnesty international, Berlin) spoke on the human rights situation in general and on amnesty international in particular. How might it be possible to include the thought of human rights in the current context of security policy, marked by collapsing nations, lawless zones, various conflicts and not least the terrorist attack of 9/11? Standards attained in human rights work were increasingly being circumvented by new security legislation. Amnesty might well have become almost a global player after 42 years' existence, but human rights protection was nonetheless being assigned to a subordinate ranking. Human rights were being abused as a basis for legitimizing war, and things were in a bad way for the enforcement of currently valid UN human rights conventions.

The establishment of the International Criminal Court promised much for the future, as an individual was no longer able to hide behind the much called-upon sovereignty of the state in crimes against humanity. However, many states – the USA included – were trying to fight the International Criminal Court.

Lochbihler stressed the indivisibility and universality of human rights. During the Cold War a distinction had still been made between civil and social (inferior) rights. Instead of making any judgement in this case, the approach should be to make social or collective rights individually actionable. Furthermore, it was not possible to relate human rights to a geographic region. The claim was often made that a different understanding of human rights prevails in Asia or Islamic countries. However, human rights were actually inherent in every culture and were universal in nature.

Finally Cornelia Füllkrug-Weitzel (Stuttgart) gave her opinion of the preconditions and tensions for joint undertakings between development cooperation, human rights protection and civil conflict management, against the backdrop of the work of Brot für die Welt (BFDW). On the one hand BFDW provides aid for civilian society and on the other it gives admonishments at state level. In its work BFDW is constantly confronted with conflicts and human rights abuses and has always thought about incorporating other approaches into its own work. The unconditional intervention by human rights organizations for victims of state and non-state violence was in many cases perceived as one-sided partisanship as far as development cooperation was concerned. In the meantime however BFDW had come to understand its work as rea-

ching beyond the direct support of parties on the ground. The question even arose whether development cooperation might contribute towards resolving conflicts, or whether it, like human rights protection, might actually intensify conflicts.

Füllkrug-Weitzel referred to the discussions of the 1970s in which violent means of enforcing fairer conditions were seen as completely legitimate and appropriate within development cooperation. Only when the Cold War ended was violence increasingly identified as a problem. Development cooperation was also not prepared for managing and analysing conflicts. Lack of knowledge might lead to escalation. For this reason it was important to work together with those involved in civil conflict management.

In the following discussion Barbara Lochbihler called for minimum standards for a fair procedure, and Martina Fischer returned to the snap mechanical assertion that poverty leads to war. The danger of this hypothesis lies in the unthinking assumption that combatting poverty is adequate conflict management. There were also demands for more coherence between the various protagonists, even when this actually amounted to "pooling the experience of powerlessness" (Füllkrug-Weitzel).

The second part of the conference took the form of four workgroups which discussed the cases of Chad, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Guatemala and Sri Lanka.

In Chad and the Cameroons an international network of environmental, development, human rights, peace and advocacy organizations has been actively involved around the oil-mining project since 1997. Areas of tension have arisen in this network due to differing objectives and interests: environmental groups were trying to prevent the oil-mining project; while development groups were seeking to get the project organized under socially acceptable conditions. Tensions were also engendered by the marked difference in readiness to take risks, which was significantly higher in human rights groups.

Common to all was the feeling of powerlessness in the face of the global Esso corporation. Over time, however, the network also developed common political goals. Synergizing influences included building up personal relations, learning together in the context of different fields of competence, identifying new possibilities for action from the association's breadth of content and methodology, and undergoing political growth together on the job.

Experiences in Bosnia-Herzegovina in the post-war period revealed many aims and projects common to the three spheres of activity. These included dealing with the past, (re-)creating identity, neutrality, inclusivity and educational measures. Aspects identified as areas of tension were those with an influence on the work of all three fields, but which evaded any influence from them, such as building economic structures, implementing economic, social and cultural human rights and clarifying the structure of the state. Activities identified as successful included stopping human trafficking and reinforcing women's rights.

Common aspects of the work by the three fields in the peace process in Guatemala were identified by the workgroup as reappraising the civil war, managing individual traumas, recognising the inevitability of a long-term involvement, building up partnerships and trust, and also experiencing lack of security in a weak state characterised by mafia-style structures. Areas of tension included communication between the groups and the issue of how victims and perpetrators of violence should be dealt with. Different opinions prevailed about how the perpetrators' side should be included in the process. Synergizing influences and successful outcomes included building networks, using multi-track approaches, and teamwork between the three fields in their respective areas of competence: reappraisal by human rights; monitoring by civil conflict management; and orientation towards the future by development cooperation.

According to the workgroup, peace and development had been brought about and human rights observed in Sri Lanka through management of current human rights abuses, monitoring, reconstruction, repatriation of refugees, landmine clearance, construction of civilian social structures and dialogue between the various parties. The three fields were united in their support of the peace process as a whole. They were divided by issues over the fair distribution of development aid and differing assessment of on the one hand civil and political and on the other economic, social and cultural human rights. Synergies and shared success evidently arose from concrete cooperation every time. All three spheres of activity benefited from the ceasefire achieved.

In the concluding discussion it was constantly reiterated that the root of any divisions did not lie between the civil groups themselves but between civil and state protagonists. All the workgroups clearly found it difficult to formulate ex-

actly what caused divisions. Certain differences had been detected, it is true, but these did not lead to insurmountable obstacles, but rather had to end in a kind of sharing out of work, since many groups were active in more than one field in any case. Differences did not really cause divisions, so long as nobody insisted that there was only one correct way of working.

Carina Fiebich, FernUniversität Hagen

Contact: Evangelische Akademie Bad Boll, Akademieweg 11, 73087 Bad Boll, Germany, Tel.: +49-7164-79-0, Fax: +49-7164-79-440, email: info@ev-akademie-boll.de, www.ev-akademie-boll.de

The Future of Peace – Views of Younger Peace and Conflict Researchers

Conference of the chair of political science and contemporary history at the University of Mannheim held 24-26 October 2003 at the Evangelische Akademie in Arnoldshain, sponsored by the Deutsche Stiftung Friedensforschung (DSF)

This conference on the future of peace held at the Evangelische Akademie Arnoldshain at the end of October 2003 studied the opinions of German peace researchers on the future of peace and how they viewed the outlook for their own future. The conference took the form of discussions between peace researchers with many years experience and up-and-coming academics in the field. Several topics repeatedly came under discussion – for instance a dispute over whether peace and conflict research was a value-driven field of study, and the question of whether it had recently set out along the path of contributing towards re-legitimizing war.

Egbert Jahn (University of Mannheim) began by outlining the evolution of peace and conflict research in Germany and attempted to explain it with the aid of a

model based on generations. According to this, since the second half of the 1960s academics who were already established at a university had supported the institutionalization of peace and conflict research, as had their colleagues, who were establishing themselves at the same time, and journalists. There then followed a generation of researchers surging onto the market, since most academic chairs were already filled. Jahn conceded that in each of these generations there were people of differing ages, and that later it was no longer possible to discern any clearcut groups. For this reason he fell back on a socio-political concept of generations, in which intellectual principles and approaches were shaped by trenchant experiences gained between the ages of 15 and 25 years. Thus the experience of the Second World War had led early peace researchers to concentrate on international wars and nuclear weapons. The Cuba crisis, détente and cracks in reform in Germany had induced the next generation to work on civil wars, the Third World and structural violence, giving rise to a rift between conventional and "critical" peace and conflict research. The difference had in the meantime eroded and the "critical" branch had been integrated into academic institutions – also as a result of the debate about INF modernization with discussions that transcended party positions.

Jahn concluded with two observations on present peace research. On one hand, he claimed, younger researchers took little interest in a theoretical explanation of the peace concept or large-scale debates on possible routes to world peace. On the other, peace and conflict research had modified its approach condemning violence towards one in which new justifications were found for military intervention. This was certainly reminiscent of being value-bound. Jahn's first observation was supported by Astrid Sahn (University of Mannheim) and Sabine Fischer (FU Berlin), based on an uprising taking place in peace research: the new generation of peace researchers was more pragmatic and identified itself more strongly with its academic subject than with the demands

AFB Reference Library

Online search now available at: www.priub.org !

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Stock: | 12,800 titles, 440 periodicals/information sources |
| Growth: | some 400 titles per year |
| Catalogue: | catalogued by hand under 145 rubrics, and using library computer system LIDOS 6.0 |
| Opening hours: | Mondays to Thursdays from 8.30 a.m. to 6.15 p.m., Fridays from 8.30 a.m. to 3.15 p.m. |

Those wishing to visit the library are kindly requested to telephone in advance – thank you!
Telephone: +49-228-356032

The "Raketenabwehr International" Internet Project introduces itself

Arms Control Expert Community and Discourse Structuring
The increasing steadiness of the cross-institutional internet project

Project Manager: Dr. habil. Bernd W. Kubbig; Colleagues: Martina Glebocki, Alexander Wicker, Rachel Adam; Duration: 1.10.2001 – 30.9.2004; Partners: Arbeitsstelle Friedensforschung Bonn (AFB), Evangelische Kirchen in Hessen und Nassau (EKHN), Vereinigung Deutscher Wissenschaftler (VDW)

With the internet project (www.hsfk.de/abm) sponsored by the Deutsche Stiftung Friedensforschung (DSF), the Koordinationsgruppe Raketenabwehrforschung International is pursuing the goal of working up the problems to do with security policy surrounding the topic of missile defence for the media, for decision-makers in government and parliament, for academia and for the peace and security policy community. The project which goes hand-in-hand with policy is – as far as we can see – currently the only one of its kind in the world, which is devoted full-time solely to this topic and its related aspects. The transfer of specialist knowledge finds its expression in current analyses (Bulletins) on the one hand, and on the other in a forum for communication and formation of opinion offered by the working parties located in Berlin.

The missile defence policy area is being picked out as a central theme mainly in the specialist press at the moment and has proved to be a cross-sectional topic, which can be linked with explosive current issues just as well as with fundamental issues (for instance to do with German foreign policy or American hegemony, world order and regional policy). An example of this is the treatment of missile defence within the framework of the conference cycle "Flashpoint Persian Gulf", sponsored by the DSF, in the German Parliament (the basis for the Campus publication "Flashpoint Iraq"). We aim to document this cross-sectional potential in our Bulletins, and also in the meetings of our working parties.

In the Bulletins, 41 issues of which have appeared online up to the end of March 2004, specialists present academic results in a meaningful way in the form of background analyses. The most recently published Bulletins, for example, are devoted to the following topics:

- Patriot missiles and AWACS surveillance aircraft for Israel and Turkey: the German discussion in the context of the Iraq
- Partnership or opposition? Russia's missile defence policy since 11 September

- Can a divided US government still prevent the existence of a North Korea with nuclear weapons?

At the same time, we published a few of the Bulletins, concerned with the situation in Asia, in a special topic issue entitled "Achsen und Allianzen – Konfliktstoff Raketenabwehr in Asien" (Axes and alliances – cause for conflict missile defence in Asia) in the journal "asien afrika lateinamerika" (Vol. 30, No. 6, December 2002). At present we are preparing further Bulletins with articles by specialists from several countries, which will be collected together into a special topic volume entitled "Democracies and Defenses. How and Why Democratic Countries Differ in their Assessment of Missile Defense as a Response to Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD)". Key issues of this comparative plan are: Why is the USA with a current budget of more than 8 billion dollars world-wide the main slave-driver of missile defence projects? Why is Israel constantly building up its capacities in this area and for what reason is there an increased tendency towards expanding a missile defence system currently apparent in Japan? Germany faces important decisions: On what financial order of magnitude should it continue with the MEADS defence programme*? Which commitments should the Federal government agree to in the framework of the NATO defence studies currently in progress? These background analyses with their focus on content are also intended to give our target group concise and reliable information at first hand – and offer possible explanations for the missile defence policy in various democracies.

Luckily, from the point of view of promoting up-and-coming research, we are able to publish a series of very good seminar, master's, and PhD examination papers under the rubric "Uni-Forum". The internet project has proved to be a welcome opportunity for young academics to network among themselves. We have put together the most important documents under a further rubric – "Hintergrund" (background).

The DSF project with the meetings of the missile defence working party is currently placing its emphasis on the topic "Coping with Regional Conflicts and Global Proliferation Risks". These one-day conferences, most of which take place at the regional agency for Hesse at the Federal Government offices, have become a fixture and something of a leading light for nationwide peace research in the capital city. Our HSFK project group has also developed into a coordinating factor for relevant expertise from the whole of the

country. The circle of some 50 regular participants includes decision-makers, journalists, students and specialists from relevant institutions. We know from discussions that the participants value being confronted with points of view for and against theirs in the formation of opinion and making of decisions. As a whole we must be one of the main addresses for topic-related queries at home and abroad. The coordinating group is furthermore represented internationally at relevant conferences.

The highlight of our project-related activities, with enormous potential for further development, is the specialist dialogue recently begun with Iranian colleagues. On 5 March 2004 the first Dialogue Forum of Iranian and German Experts took place amid the greatest confidentiality in Berlin. This academic forum is to be continued in Tehran in the autumn. New conceptual challenges have arisen from the contact with our Iranian colleagues. These relate to the role of Europe at the intersection of an offensive American policy of democratization and missile defence, the search for a European profile of our own, and the urgency of new approaches (catchword: missile free zone in the Near East/in the Persian Gulf region). The standard premises of the motto "Diplomacy first!", which directs our entire project, could come in useful again here.

Those interested in working on the main topic in a profitable way suitable for the target group as part of a project which goes hand-in-hand with policy for a period of two years, must be innovative and flexible in the prescribed project framework. This applies equally to the Bulletins and to the working party meetings. Assuming that further funding is forthcoming, the Raketenabwehr International coordinating group would happily continue to contribute towards ensuring that German peace research in Berlin has a visible presence and is active in an innovative way both through analyses and communication and networking in politically explosive policy areas.

Bernd W. Kubbig, Frankfurt

Contact: Raketenabwehrforschung International, c/o Dr. habil. Bernd W. Kubbig, Hessische Stiftung Friedens- und Konfliktforschung, Leimenrode 29, 60322 Frankfurt am Main, Germany, Tel.: +49-69-959-104-36, Fax: +49-69-558-481, email: kubbig@hsfk.de, www.hsfk.de/abm

* Medium Extended Air Defense System (MEADS).

of cross-disciplinary peace studies. However, as the conference continued doubts were raised about the first observation: it was not so much a lack of philosophy that people had noticed as a temporary loss in groundedness.

Jahn's attempt to explain changes in peace and conflict research in relation to research generations provoked several objections. Christoph Weller (Institut für Entwicklung und Frieden, Universität Duisburg) insisted that this resulted in the role of academic institutions being underestimated; when in doubt, the university at which someone had studied was more important than his or her age. Weller and Harald Müller (Hessische Stiftung Friedens- und Konfliktforschung, HSFK, University of Frankfurt) went on to list a series of influential experiences which Jahn had not taken into consideration – for instance, the Vietnam War, the Auschwitz trial and the INF modernization debate. Ulrich Schneckener (Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik, Berlin) added the Bosnian war to this list. If this list continues to grow, however, is it still suitable for delimiting common "generations"?

Dispute over the discipline's value commitment

Under Weller's direction, the panel then opened the dispute over peace and conflict research's commitment to norms. Should it adhere to a model of peace or avoidance of violence? According to Weller this was not only unnecessary but would lead to prejudices and blind spots in the research. Weller approached the concept of violence in a constructivist way, in which the question of what represents legitimate force and what illegitimate violence was answered in each individual case of social dispute. It was not possible to make a neutral, purely academic judgement about it. Nonetheless, he observed critically in his conference paper, peace research largely tacitly presupposed a distinction of this kind and in so doing legitimized certain forms of violence – even if it acknowledged the organizational role of states and the associated domestic monopoly on violence. Weller put the case in favour of instead describing the legitimization process of violence without normative prejudices. Thorsten Bonacker (University of Marburg) reached a similar conclusion based on consideration of violence's destructive momentum.

During the course of the conference a real conflict between generations became apparent, between older researchers and some of the younger ones. Established

representatives of peace and conflict research such as Egbert Jahn, Lothar Brock, Volker Matthies and Harald Müller declared that this discipline's value commitment was for them self-evident. Some of the younger researchers also defended this normative approach.

The opposite side of the coin is partly an issue of emphasis with its roots in academic work. The first generation, explained Jahn, did not view peace research as a discipline with its own subject matter, but as a peace-orientated, normative method of approach for all disciplines. However, it became institutionalized within the framework of certain disciplines, principally in political science. In this field, values are not a recognized academic argument; those seeking to hold their own against academic competition would have to be wary of normative arguments. This was confirmed in commentaries by Tanja Brühl (University of Frankfurt) and Peter Imbusch (University of Marburg) on the setting up of relevant subsidiary or foundation courses at several German universities: peace and conflict research had to be presented as a discipline with its own subject matter and methods, not as a miscellany held together by an orientation towards some norm.

Is value-free peace research possible?

Those who defend value commitment are also reluctant to make the declaration of belief in certain values or a certain concept of peace and violence into an entrance requirement for peace and conflict research. For example Harald Müller joined Weller in rejecting the concept of "structural violence" as a never-ending extension of the concept. However, the discussion of value issues no doubt belonged at the heart of peace research for them. The disagreement seemed to lie in this: Weller and Bonacker did not deny that as citizens they made value judgements, but probably did deny that they did this as academics and as part of their research. Egbert Jahn among others stated in response that value-free peace research was impossible. Even the issue of what should be studied, and a glance at the subject matter – whether for example analysis of a war should consider shifts in power or the suffering of the victims – was stamped by presuppositions, and without the hypothesis that there is an alternative to war and violence there would simply be no peace research. The capacity to make sound value judgements therefore belonged to this specialist skill, declared Christoph Humrich (University of Mannheim).

Hermann Düringer, director of the Evangelische Akademie Arnoldshain, attempted to mediate: even if it was impossible to determine a norm that was binding for everybody, it was nonetheless possible to assume a common meeting point, a minimum of shared values. If the army were to say "We want another war, it turns men into men", peace and conflict research would surely hardly be able to accept that. However, conference participants were unable to agree on the pragmatic solution of analysing concepts but assuming a nucleus of shared norms. Instead, they engaged in what one person from the floor described as a very German debate.

This debate also came across as rather contrived, as even those defending a value commitment were putting forward arguments to do with ethics based not on personal convictions but on responsibility. The reference to values did not imply any rejection of military violence in principle; in Arnoldshain the consensus was widely that use of military violence would have to be assessed case to case.

The return to "justified" warfare

The panel looked into the new "interventionism" and its criteria. Peter Mayer (University of Tübingen) spoke in favour of taking the doctrine of just – or better nowadays: justified – war more seriously than was customary. However Gertrud Brücher (University of Marburg) warned that the "rulification" of the exception, namely war, threatened to make it the rule. Andreas Herberg-Rothe (Humboldt-Universität Berlin) raised the objection that no war had ever satisfied all the specified criteria for a "just" armed encounter. From this he drew the conclusion that the doctrine served to legitimize unjust wars. Ulrich Schneckener drew the opposite conclusion: the doctrine was not manageable as a foundation for judgement by political decision-makers, as these latter never fully foresaw the consequences of their decisions for or against military intervention and therefore could not know in advance whether all criteria had been satisfied. He went on to ask which criteria should be given precedence. The result of the debate was as follows: on the one hand the doctrine of a just war serves to delimit as well as justify wars; on the other, even those opposed to war have to form their judgement by falling back on criteria which for the most part strongly resemble this doctrine, so it is not a simple matter to dismiss them.

Next, the panel addressed the question of how the most recent military interventions should be judged by debating general philosophical principles and principles of international law. This method did not bring them very close to the issue. Instead of weighing up the consequences of and alternatives to interventions in individual cases, people ended up arguing over whether Habermas had understood Hegel correctly in his justification of the war in Kosovo. Large numbers of the delegates must not have followed this; there was talk of “academic pie in the sky” in the corridors afterwards.

How new are new wars?

The panel speakers provided better clarification of the new international system and “new” wars. Nobody shared the view of Herfried Münkler, that “new” wars were characterized by denationalized violence and now represented the greatest threat to peace. Admittedly it was true, as Harald Müller and Lothar Brock said, that war economies in some conflicts had assumed a dynamic of their own and in some poor countries helped determine the course of wars. However in Arnoldshain everyone was agreed that this applied at most to a quarter of the world’s wars and did not mean that the problem of wars in the classical sense had been resolved. Dietrich Jung (Copenhagen Peace Research Institute) warned against interpreting “new” wars as merely economically or criminally motivated outbreaks of violence and stripping them of their political character. In the first place, it was rarely clear whether such wars were indicators of the process of a nation falling apart rather than more likely the process of a nation being built. This latter had to occur under different circumstances from those in European history – i.e. in post-colonial societies already part of an established state system. In the second place, categorising a party in a war as a terrorist or criminal band would lead to people refusing from the outset to take note of possible political concerns. There would then no longer be any question of seeking political solutions.

Peter Kreuzer (HSFK) formulated a further critical point: peace research considered civil wars in the south mainly from the point of view of the threat they posed to the north and international order – that is to say they looked down on them. This viewpoint was partly to blame for the impression of chaotic violence; those affected possibly had quite a different perception of the war in their country. He put the case in favour of greater efforts to take up the perspective “from below” and

investigate how the cultures and political systems in question perceive, legitimize and more or less successfully contain violence. This approach was more appropriate when seeking suitable ways of settling certain civil wars.

The idea that “new” wars were essentially structure the international system was also dismissed. Schneckener made the distinction in terms of ideal types between three worlds, in which each subscribed to a different logic determining their actions in war and peace: the classic Westphalian state system with wars between states as the model for violence; a post-Westphalian world in which security policy is internationalized, with humanitarian interventions as the form of violence; and finally the pre-Westphalian world of “new” wars. In this case he viewed the task as lying in building functional states. However Hans-Joachim Spanger (HSFK) raised the objection that the world of the OECD, before embarking upon this task, ought to ask itself what it had contributed towards the collapse of the state in poor countries. The trend towards humanitarian interventions in the south reminded him of neo-colonialism – even as far as their legitimization as civilizing influences.

Disagreement persisted over whether the state was in decline as a protagonist with a determining influence in the international system. Lothar Brock emphasized that globalization had admittedly relativized borders, but on the other side of the coin there was the attempt by leading states to draw up new borders and consolidate old ones. To account for the mistaken idea that the state was losing importance, Ulrich Teusch (University of Trier) used the decline of the welfare state compared with the expanding role of the state in security policy. Spanger was unable to recognise even a general decline in the welfare state, going on cutbacks in the state quota, in industrial countries.

Kissing the state goodbye is out of fashion

A minority opinion was reflected in a paper by Bernhard Zangl (University of Bremen), who was unable to come to Arnoldshain in person. He identified the USA’s war against Iraq as a sign that decisions over war and peace were now fundamentally influenced by international public opinion. Harald Müller took issue with this, among others: the USA had taken the decision to go to war alone; the fact that it then sought international support was nothing new. Politics at the time of the Cold War had been more strongly transnationalized within both blocks than

nowadays. Egbert Jahn stressed that even when states were no longer able to take action alone, this was not necessarily a sign of denationalization, but rather of “coordinated statehood”.

A further panel made a critical examination of the theory stating that democracies show little tendency towards waging war between each other. Heidrun Zinnecker (HSFK) raised a series of objections to the statistical method upon which this theory of democratic peace was based, for instance against the criteria for the concept of democracy and the cutting out of factors other than the form of government. Qualitative case studies were more meaningful. Margit Bussmann (University of Constance) admitted to gaps in the basic data, but defended the quantitative method in theory. She reported on an attempt to introduce the democratic background of states as an additional variable, which led to the result that the meaningfulness of the variable “democratic form of government” actually decreased against tendency towards war.

On the whole, observed Schneckener, it has fallen out of fashion to kiss the state goodbye in the FKF. The role of the USA receives increasing attention since the wars in Kosovo and now in Iraq. Scepticism towards military interventions has grown, as it would appear in Arnoldshain. Dietrich Jung was reluctant to dismiss such interventions out of hand. However he perceived the problem to be that military solutions carry more weight than they should in politics. The FKF was therefore getting caught up in the primacy of security thinking. It was being increasingly forced to replace the question of how the use of violence might be avoided with that of which dangers posed a threat to us and how they might be repelled by military means.

As an example of this, Jung cited the merging of his Copenhagen Peace Research Institute with a larger institute to do with foreign affairs. Volker Matthies (University of Hamburg) confirmed this pressure to carry out more classic security research for the German Armed Forces Command and Staff College (Führungsakademie der Bundeswehr). For both, this touched upon the foundations of peace and conflict research. Against this background the debate on value commitment appeared in quite a different light. The experience that there is less political demand for the original momentum behind critical appraisal of violence may well be a reason why some peace researchers are insisting on this momentum at this very time.

Bernd Ludermann, Hamburg

Contact: Lehrstuhl für Politische Wissenschaft und Zeitgeschichte an der Universität Mannheim, Prof. Dr. Egbert Jahn, Seminargebäude A 5, 68131 Mannheim, Germany, Tel.: +49-621-181-2088, Fax: +49-621-181-2087, email: lsjahn@sowi.uni-mannheim.de, www.sowi.uni-mannheim.de/lehrstuehle/lspolzg

Peace theory – Orientations for peace policy and peace work

Conference at the Evangelische Akademie Loccum in collaboration with Arbeitskreis "Friedenstheorie" from the Arbeitsgemeinschaft für Friedens- und Konfliktforschung e.V. (AFK), held 12-14 December 2003

The foundations of this conference were some 90 participants in the activities of the Theory workgroup from the Arbeitsgemeinschaft für Friedens- und Konfliktforschung e.V. (AFK), which has been working on the principles of and changes in peace theory in several workshops over recent years.

A key issue was which theoretical orientations peace theory is able to provide against a backdrop of rapidly changing political and social realities, and which influence it can exercise as a result on peace policy and peace work. Even in his welcome speech to the theoreticians and practitioners present Christoph Weller (Institut für Entwicklung und Frieden, Universität Duisburg), member of the workgroup and joint conference chair with Jörg Calließ (Evangelische Akademie Loccum), described the results as offerings for current peace policy and orientations for academics and those working in the field.

In his introductory paper entitled "What is peace theory and why do we pursue the study of it?" Hajo Schmidt (FernUniversität Hagen) elucidated the fundamental questions and tasks to do with peace theory facing the workgroup. In this context theory served as a space for thought for all reflections and considerations to do with the study of peace. The three most important tasks were therefore: (1) clarification of basic concepts and leading issues for current peace research (definition of peace, the concept of violence, changes); (2) work on major theories (empirical load-bearing capacity, new orientations, self-reflection); and (3) reflections on epistemology and academic theory (perspectives and concepts).

Schmidt went on to mention the inclusion of normative-ethical aspects, essential to a peace theory. So for example

Prize for Young Researchers sponsored by the AFK Christiane Rajewsky Prize

The German Association for Peace and Conflict Research (AFK: Arbeitsgemeinschaft für Friedens- und Konfliktforschung) awards this prize to young researchers or initiatives by young researchers that have made an outstanding contribution to peace and conflict research. The prize is dedicated to the memory of peace researcher Christiane Rajewsky, who as professor at the department of social affairs at the Fachhochschule in Düsseldorf did so much to encourage up-and-coming researchers. The prize has been awarded since 1993 and is worth € 500. The prize-winning entry is published in the form of an essay.

The prize is awarded every February during the annual AFK colloquium.

Entries considered are works relevant to peace and conflict research, generally in written form, which fulfil one of the following criteria:

- make a particular contribution to research, for example examination essays, dissertations or media productions;
- make a particular contribution to disseminating peace and conflict research in teaching, society or politics;
- make an outstanding contribution to public relations work on peace and conflict research.
- The upper age limit for candidates is 35.

The deadline for submitting entries for the prize in any given year is

1. November.

Entries should be addressed to the chair of the judges' panel (see below):

Contact: Prof. Dr. Hanne-Margret Birckenbach, Institut für Politikwissenschaft, Universität Gießen, Karl-Gloeckner-Str.21/E, 35394 Gießen, Germany, Tel.: +49-641-9923112, Fax: +49-641-9923119, email: Hanne.Birckenbach@sowi.uni-giessen.de, www.uni-giessen.de

the demand for justice would have to be responded to in constantly new ways. He thus simultaneously made it clear that elaboration of theory was a continual task and that contradictions between normative requirements and practical action would have to be understood as an incentive to carry development further. The capacity of peace theory for connection and enrichment was therefore of prime importance.

The following discussion round entitled "Hopes for the end of the story of violence – Outlines in peace theory for recognizing and managing violence" was characterized by the effort to reach a better understanding of the essence of peace. Christopher Daase (University of Kent/Brussels) pointed out that knowledge of war was indispensable in order to get closer to peace. However this had remained largely unfinished work in peace research. The transformation of warfare of all things required in-depth study. Although many theories also aroused hope in an end to war and violence, it nonetheless remained unlikely that war would be overcome.

Even an intensified study of patterns of war and conflict was not able appropriately to register the many and varied factors of violence. Daase pointed to a way in which this complexity could be better handled by calling for more committed interdisciplinary action in peace research.

Sven Chojnacki (Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin) put forward a similar argument by calling for an explanation of its theoretical principles from peace and conflict research, as its analyses and concepts, for instance of "new" wars, were often highly arbitrary. He used this very example to illustrate the importance of clarifying methodological principles in the analysis of conflicts. Chojnacki also warned against wearing out the "new", as change was after all nothing unusual, but instead rooted in social, societal, political and cultural changes in structure. Therefore this made a theoretical definition impossible.

The enormous variety of possible patterns for interpretation became evident during the course of the papers given by Michael Haspel (University of

Marburg) from the perspective of peace ethics and Ruth Seifert (Fachhochschule Regensburg) from that of gender theory. Haspel emphasized that in the meantime waging war had come to have to be justified by democracies at considerable expense, in the process drawing increasingly ethical issues into the centre frame. At the same time it was acceptable to treat new (e.g. technical) developments, international law issues, issues of legitimacy or structural causes of war in the form of theoretical discourses, without in the process losing sight of the interdependence of the most diverse factors and breaking up reality. Against this background, peace theory (and ethics of peace as a component part of it) could relinquish any systematic framework.

A part of this external demarcation was elaborated by Ruth Seifert, who nevertheless emphasized that the gender perspective lay at right angles to the concepts expounded so far. Gender structures might be resolving or intensifying factors in warlike disputes, as for example in the former Yugoslavia. Gender concepts might reinforce inequalities. They were also abused for and during the war and led to crimes and human rights abuses. In the final analysis they were not exclusive criteria but merely a component part of complex processes.

Besides some criticism of the commentaries so far, the following plenary discussion revealed a consensus: in order to be understood and to be of

use, theory cannot do without practical examples and act in a vacuum. Just as human beings cannot hold their breath for too long without coming to harm, nor can theory hold back practice.

To conclude the first day, Richard Ned Lebow (University of Hanover, USA) illustrated this point in his lively paper entitled "The Future of Politics between Violence and Order - Theoretical Orientations". First he drew attention to the contributions by the peace movement and peace studies to the fall of the Iron Curtain, which in his opinion, despite the fixation of political theory on power issues, were able to contribute to a change in policy. With reference to Antiquity, he went on to outline the consequences of success and power with regard to the USA.

Publications from the German Institute for Human Rights

Marita Körner: Das internationale Menschenrecht auf Arbeit. Völkerrechtliche Anforderungen an Deutschland. Berlin: Deutsches Institut für Menschenrechte, 2004. 62 pp. (Study)

Jakob Schneider: Die Justiziabilität wirtschaftlicher, sozialer und kultureller Rechte. Berlin: Deutsches Institut für Menschenrechte, 2004, 43 pp.

Russland auf dem Weg zum Rechtsstaat? Antworten aus der Zivilgesellschaft. From the Russian by Andrea Gotzes. Berlin: Deutsches Institut für Menschenrechte, 2003. 239 pp.

Anna Würth: Dialog mit dem Islam als Konfliktprävention? Zur Menschenrechtspolitik gegenüber islamisch geprägten Staaten. Berlin: Deutsches Institut für Menschenrechte, 2003. 71 pp. (Study) (can be downloaded in pdf-format from the institute's web site)

David Nii Addy: Diskriminierung und Rassismus. Internationale Verpflichtungen und nationale Herausforderungen für die Menschenrechtsarbeit in Deutschland. Berlin: Deutsches Institut für Menschenrechte, 2003. 75 pp. (Study)

Wolfgang S. Heinz, Stephanie Schlitt, Anna Würth: Internationale Terrorismusbekämpfung und Menschenrechte (Oktober 2001 – April 2003). Berlin: Deutsches Institut für Menschenrechte, 2003. 67 pp. (Study)

Anja Mihr: Die deutsche Menschenrechts-Berichterstattung gegenüber den Vereinten Nationen (während der 14. Legislaturperiode des Deutschen Bundestags). Berlin: Deutsches Institut für Menschenrechte, 2003. 31 pp.

Anja Mihr: Die Berichterstattung zu Deutschland in Europäischen Menschenrechtsinstitutionen. Berlin: Deutsches Institut für Menschenrechte, 2003. 22 pp.

Petra Follmar-Otto, Hendrik Cremer: Das neue Zusatzprotokoll zur UN-Anti-Folter-Konvention. Berlin: Deutsches Institut für Menschenrechte, 2004. 10 pp. (Policy Paper 2)

Menschenrechtsschutz Vereinte Nationen. Individualbeschwerdeverfahren. (translation of a publication from the UN High Commission for Human Rights, Geneva: "Human Rights Fact Sheet No.7: Complaint procedures", 2002). Berlin: Deutsches Institut für Menschenrechte, 2003. 39 pp.

Jakob Schneider: Die Justiziabilität wirtschaftlicher, sozialer und kultureller Menschenrechte. Berlin: Deutsches Institut für Menschenrechte, 2004. 43 pp. (Study)

Online at www.institut-fuer-menschenrechte.de:

Frauke Weber: Ein Nationaler Aktionsplan für Menschenrechte in Deutschland? Erfahrungen mit bereits existierenden Menschenrechtsplänen und Empfehlungen für die Erarbeitung eines Nationalen Aktionsplans für Menschenrechte in Deutschland. Berlin: Deutsches Institut für Menschenrechte, 2003. 44 pp.

Petra Follmar, Wolfgang S. Heinz, Benjamin Schulz: Zur aktuellen Folterdebatte in Deutschland. Beiträge des Deutschen Instituts für Menschenrechte. Berlin: Deutsches Institut für Menschenrechte, 2003. 11 pp. (Policy Paper 1)

Claudia Lohrenscheit, Nils Rosemann: Perspektiven entwickeln – Menschenrechtsbildung in Deutschland. Zusammenfassung der Ergebnisse zur Bestandsaufnahme und Positionsbestimmung des Deutschen Instituts für Menschenrechte (February 2003). 17 pp.

Report on the International Seminar: "The proposal for an Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, Berlin 30./31. January 2003. Berlin: Deutsches Institut für Menschenrechte, 2003. 20 pp.

The optional protocol to CEDAW: International Training Seminar for NGOs and women's rights activists. Seminar Documentation, Berlin, 13-15 March 2003. Berlin: Deutsches Institut für Menschenrechte, 2003. 28 pp.

Menschenrechtsinstrumente: Für Frauen nutzen. Konferenzdokumentation, Abgeordnetenhaus Berlin, 13. Dezember 2002. Berlin: Deutsches Institut für Menschenrechte, 2003. 36 pp.

Menschenrechtliche Erfordernisse bei der Bekämpfung des Terrorismus. Bericht und Beiträge zu einem Arbeitsgespräch am 19. April 2002 im Französischen Dom/Berlin-Mitte. Berlin: Deutsches Institut für Menschenrechte, 2002. 42 pp.

Contact: Deutsches Institut für Menschenrechte Zimmerstr. 26/27, 10969 Berlin, Germany, Tel.: +49-30-259-359-0, email: info@institut-fuer-menschenrechte.de, www.institut-fuer-menschenrechte.de

Like the city-state Athens in its day, the United States, intoxicated by its size, had lost interest in equality and justice towards the community of states, but would have to compensate for this disregard for other interests through coercion, intimidation and bribery, in order to preserve its own power. However, this pride (Hybris) would inevitably lead to avenging justice (Nemesis) and to the fall of the once respected leader. Lebow drew attention to his exaggerated representation, but was able to show at the same time that order needs a fixed framework and every power that sets itself above the community becomes a danger to the community and to itself. The only possible way of countering this pride, according to Lebow, was through continuous and persistent dialogue with the other party, especially since power did not manifest itself in only one concept but could take on a variety of forms.

On the second day, history again informed many speakers' contributions. An experimental dialogue examined the "causes and conditions of peace", throwing up the question of how far the theory of the "civilizational hexagon"¹ bore fruit in this context. The "inventor" of the civilizational hexagon, Dieter Senghaas (University of Bremen), first of all with the aid of the visual arts presented impressions of history from the perspective of peace and justice. He demonstrated on the one hand the historically determined and culturally limited formation of order. So for example in many parts of Europe the debate on the monopoly on violence flowed into the formation of certain forms of rule of law, which however was not the case in other parts of the world. On the other, Senghaas clearly showed that worlds of images and concepts are constantly open to change, they fall apart and are reborn, and in this way indicate the change in social structures. This variety could not be reduced to a common denominator, not even in his conception of the civilizational hexagon, which he went on to compare with Rainer Tetzlaff's "hexagon of decivilizing forces". Regardless of this, the image of the hexagon projected onto reality was nonetheless able to reveal crucial prerequisites for a peaceful co-existence.

Senghaas was supported on this point by specialist in cultural and Islamic studies Gudrun Krämer (FU Berlin), who emphasized that Senghaas's model taken on its own merit made total sense. Other cultures had other images, for instance relating to justice. In Islamic

communities the image of peace was different to that in western discourse, characterized not by calmness as in St Augustine, but by the necessity for constant intervention. Krämer also ascertained that not only the images but also the interpretations linked to these impressions were different. The construction of the notion of belonging somewhere and of not belonging, of the world of relative peace and the (violent) rest of the world, led in Krämer's opinion to erroneous acceptance and exclusion. At the end of the day, these mistaken cultural impressions were no more than artificial constructs, more an indication of one-sided, inflexible thought processes than representing a true-to-life image of cultural diversity.

The third participant in the experimental dialogue, Stefan Oeter (University of Hamburg), also expressed doubt in the practical relevance of the hexagonal model. He conceded that it had fundamentally contributed towards redirecting peace discourse from its focus on international relations and violence to focusing on domestic social structures. In this case the model worked very well for ordering domestic peace. On the other hand it could not be transferred into international contexts, because it had to retain its hexagonal structure. In Oeter's opinion a factor against this was the confusion and variety of relevant topics, many of which had only recently started to find their way into public discourse, as for example the discussions about democratic deficiencies in international decision-making processes.

Furthermore Oeter referred to the fact that it would be difficult to explain the increasing rulification of international law and at the same time the failure to enforce and have a part in the same, using the hexagon model. The following plenary discussion voiced the question of the extent to which the theory was capable of reflecting reality, or whether it did not in fact make reality up for itself. The issue was also raised of how it would be possible to deal with cultural, religious and social heterogeneity in such a construct.

The following discussion round entitled "The containment of war through democracy" put a further theoretical approach under the microscope. In his paper, Harald Müller (Hessische Stiftung Friedens- und Konfliktforschung, HSFK, University of Frankfurt) posed the question: what use is the theory of democratic peace to us? By the end of his lecture, his reply was that peaceableness did not grow from structures but from

practice. Admittedly it could be ascertained that democracies (first and foremost among one another) effectively were more peaceable than non-democracies. But neither rationalist, institutional nor normative arguments could plausibly reveal why warlike tendencies continue to exist in democracies too. Rather, a teleological understanding formed the basis of the theory of democratic peace, which blocked the view of the differences within the various democracies.

Müller expressed his opposition to an inevitability which was unjustifiable in standard points of view. He was able to illustrate that even standard concepts and ideals were ambiguous. Even when they originated from the same source, they were often contradictory and brittle, as he could demonstrate from the development of liberalism. From this he drew the conclusion that the use of violence was not first and foremost an issue of principle but of opportunity.

Carrying on from this, the image of the theoretical construction site was used to illustrate the continuing modification and further development of theoretical discourse. A voice from a practising academic and political advisor, Thania Paffenholz (Peacebuilding Research and Advice, Bern), spoke in her paper of the need for new building blocks, without which progress was impossible. She considered first the interplay between theory and practice and formulated three challenges for peace theory. (1) On the one hand it should make a greater selection of theories available. (2) On the other it ought to give people visions of a possible peace. (3) Finally, if this peace comes about, it should indicate the paths that led to it.

With the Lederach conflict transformation approach she presented an integrative model that had been tried out in practice and which looked at the person on the ground at the heart of considerations. The most crucial thing was that the "how" of peace work was given precedence over the "what". Paffenholz believed that this approach, together with the theory of democratic peace, could represent a robust combination of theory and practice.

In his paper Lutz Schrader (Fern-Universität Hagen) started from the assumption that theories could be put into practice in an inconsistent way and that they had a variety of possible outcomes. This danger was also present with regard to democratic peace, which threatened to become a process for world order and, in terms of theory, an

ideology. Schrader stated three reasons for analysing this theoretical school: firstly, the expansion of democracy had ground to a halt; secondly, political globalization had remained in deficit; and thirdly, the dispute between the USA and Europe raised a question over the future of liberal peace. As a consequence of this, Schrader called for a reorganization of the liberal model, whose internal logic inevitably gave rise to injustices and rifts. He also insisted on the necessity of reformulating home-grown theories, which have to include the other person in question and their requirements. This new orientation of theoretical models would have in the end to turn up as part of real progress made in the institutionalization, rulification and democratic shaping of globalization.

The final session of the second day, entitled "At peace with war? Orientation on the relationship between the 'peaceful zone' and the 'turbulent zone' based on peace theory and international law", was carried by Lothar Brock (HSFK, University of Frankfurt) and Alfred Hirsch (Institut für Entwicklung und Frieden, University of Duisburg). Brock emphasized that in spite of every difficulty the idea of peace was clearly indestructible. Mind you, the assumption could not be made that violence would therefore become unnecessary. The realization of non-violence was both theoretically and practically possible through the UN Charter and the system of collective peacekeeping. However, even the primacy of an objective international law could deliver manifold justifications for war because of a lack of central power. For this reason it was not sensible to wait until all states had a democratic constitution; it was already necessary to build up peaceful alliances while respecting positive justice. This would make it possible to take steps against tendencies to see only order on one side and chaos on the other in international politics. Hirsch added that the democratization of international politics was an essential prerequisite for the above. This would also make it possible to prevent any enforcement of a one-sided "order for world peace" arising from a republican understanding of security. However this hope would not bear much fruit if discursive power in issues of global significance remained in the hands of a few.

To close the conference this discursive power was placed in the hands of practitioners. The title "Is all theory useless without practice? Peace theory

Drastic plans for cutbacks threaten peace research institutions

Statement by the board of the Arbeitsgemeinschaft für Friedens- und Konfliktforschung¹ (AFK)

We are worried for the future of established peace research institutions. (...) The research institutes in Hamburg and Frankfurt/M. and the Landesarbeitsgemeinschaft Friedenswissenschaft (regional peace studies working party) in North Rhine-Westphalia are threatened by particularly drastic cutbacks in their respective regions.

The Senate in Hamburg is planning huge cutbacks. The most radical proposal to date plans to cut two thirds of the budget allocation for the financial year 2005 to the Institut für Friedensforschung und Sicherheitspolitik (IFSH) at the University of Hamburg. The allocations to date, amounting to € 1.3 million, do not even come to two per mil of the budget for science and research, which totals € 783 million. However, these cuts would have repercussions that could threaten the very existence of the institute. (...)

Unlike the situation in Hamburg, where various proposals for cuts are currently circulating, the plans of the regional government in Hesse are nearer to being finalized. The Ministry for Science and Art has announced radical cutbacks for the coming year for the Hessische Stiftung Friedens- und Konfliktforschung (HSFK/PRIF). Of the just under € 2.2 million originally planned, only just over € 1.7 million will now be made available. This means a cut of 20 percent for the institute, which would have the effect of saving the ministry not even 0.3 per mil – measured against the total budget of € 1.7 billion for this year. An action of this kind would lead to cuts in personnel and the termination of a series of research projects. (...)

The regional peace studies working party in North Rhine-Westphalia (LAG NRW) deals with coordinating university teaching staff in peace studies. (...) The cutbacks just made amounting to one third represent a considerable proportion. (...) As a consequence the administrative office is threatened with closure, which would bring this cooperative organization to an end. (...)

We call upon the regional governments to do all in their power at least to ensure the continued existence of peace research in its present form. Sound basic funding remains the prerequisite to enable the institutes successfully to continue raising third-party funds from research funding institutes. All this requires the currently prevailing plans for cutbacks to be set aside. (...) We further request the Senate in Hamburg to clear the way for the replacement of the position of director without delay.

Contact: Arbeitsgemeinschaft für Friedens- und Konfliktforschung e.V., Geschäftsführung, Tönninger Weg 29, 22609 Hamburg, Germany, Tel.: +49-40-800-4178, email: afkgf@aol.com, www.afk-web.de

¹German association for peace and conflict research

put to the test in practice" was intended to provoke a dialogue on the usefulness and scope of theoretical work for peace policy and peace work. Die SPD German member of parliament Uta Zapf (Berlin) criticised the rift between theory and practice and called upon theory to provide practical politics with decision-making aids and proposals for solutions. There was an enormous need for advice in politics, which was not being adequately satisfied. Besides sensitizing the general public more strongly it was crucial to find norms and standards, as

theoretical discussions would otherwise remain open-ended. Günther Baechler (Bern) from the crisis prevention department of the Swiss foreign ministry chose another approach. He demanded that practice should start by asking itself two questions: 1. Am I doing the right things?; 2. Am I doing things right?

Theory might be able to contribute guidelines by way of response, but the actual work had to be carried out according to each individual case and in the manner appropriate to the parti-

cular situation. The “selected assistant” had above all to keep their distance and be able to listen, so as to discern the interests of their partners on the ground. According to Baechler, theory could make a contribution if it changed its orientation from large theories to concrete application. Angelika Spelten (Bonn) similarly called upon the development policy agency FriEnt, to make theory concentrate on the “murky depths of ‘how’”. It would otherwise lose connection with the dynamic of influence that it itself had unleashed. There were enough concepts and tools available, however research had failed to help with applying and establishing priorities. Volker Matthies (Führungsakademie der Bundeswehr, Hamburg) urged more caution with regard to the demands of theories. A differentiated analysis of the real situation with input from other disciplines was necessary in order to extend the boundaries of knowledge. The major theories were hardly able to contribute to this as they did not take into account the differing requirements of the protagonists. In actual fact, practice was already achieving a considerable amount without necessarily referring to theory.

By the end of the conference, the number of issues had not decreased, as conference chair Weller noted in his closing speech. The necessity of engaging in a more active exchange between theory and practice had however become evident during the numerous discussions of the conference. Both fields complemented one another after all and should not be played off against one another. Peace theory makes no claims to be a ready-made formula for peace, as it is hardly able to encapsulate the subtleties and contradictions of practice in theory. The conference delegates were however unable to agree upon who was in the driving seat in the search for peace.

Ian Mengel,
University of Bonn

Contact: Evangelische Akademie
Loccum, Münchehäger Straße 6, 31547
Rehburg-Loccum, Germany; postal address:
Evangelische Akademie Loccum Postfach
21 58, 31545 Rehburg-Loccum, Germany;
Tel.: +49-57-66 /81-0 switchboard),
email: eal@evlka.de,
www.loccum.de

¹Linking of six points which mutually support one another: monopoly on violence; rule of law; democratic participation; culture of conflict; social justice; interdependencies and affective control

Imperial world order? Trends in the 21st century

32nd colloquium of the Arbeitsgemeinschaft für Friedens- und Konfliktforschung (AFK) held 20-22 February 2004 at the Evangelische Akademie Iserlohn

Almost certainly thanks to the topicality of the subject matter, the AFK’s annual conference proved very popular – in spite of or perhaps also because of the Carnival. This conference entitled “Imperial world order? Trends in the 21st century” and sponsored by the Deutsche Stiftung Friedensforschung (DSF) focused on discussing the issue of how an “American Empire” and a unipolar structure marked by this in international politics might have to be evaluated from the perspective of peace policy. The aim of the conference was firstly to illustrate current power developments in international politics in the light of historical experience and visual representations in the media, so as to be able to determine current challenges facing peace research and alternatives for power policy.

Secondly, various workgroups (Arbeitsgruppen, AG) took a look at the extent to which society’s tools, such as discourses, violence, economy, justice and countervailing force, represent the foundation of imperial rulership or might also be the pillars of a future world order. First of all two panel discussions elaborated the importance of ideas about justice for peace strategy, before going on to pick out as their central theme the development of peace research in Germany, focusing on the funding activities of the Deutsche Stiftung Friedensforschung (DSF).

In the opening lecture entitled “Pax romana? Pax americana – A balance of peace for imperial orders” famous journalist and publicist Peter Bender made a systematic comparison of the Roman empire with the “American Empire”. The knowledge gained from this comparison – in so far as one was possible – was in the structural contrast of both empires. No state since the Roman Empire has been so powerful politically, economically and culturally as the USA. The ethical justification for an empire could be measured, according to Bender, mainly by the extent to which the “underdogs” who have to choose between peace and freedom were satisfied, as empires do have an inherent tendency towards pacification but also towards suppression of liberty. The USA demanded political loyalty in

return for a comprehensive guarantee of security and peace. There is a huge contradiction inherent in its guarantee of peace on the one hand, and its uncompromising demand for political and if necessary military allegiance in the case of wars of intervention on the other. Europe was thus divided – as illustrated by the Iraq War: protection from war (by the USA) could according to Bender in the end itself lead to a war (jointly with the USA).

In his paper, Bender emphasized the unrivalled duration of the Roman Empire. Peace or pacification was able to legitimize the rulership throughout the lengthy period of 400 years. Further causes for the longevity of the Pax romana were Roman cultural imperialism and the associated romanization of the provinces, along with self-restraint in terms of power politics, which prevented the Empire from over-reaching itself geographically. However the US empire’s chances of survival were greater than those of Ancient Rome, as the USA – officially at least – was striving not for territorial gain but for the spread of its zone of influence, making it an informal empire with a far-flung sphere of influence. This was altogether a more subtle form of rulership based on a widely ramified system of (economic and security policy in particular) dependencies. Bender dubbed the USA’s form of rulership, much more complex in comparison to Rome, as “Diet Empire”, an indirect rulership without ruling, although the United States did not fail to propagate its almost missionary-like claim to world leadership.

Since imperial supremacy also altered the internal structure of a political system, and the Pax romana was only able to survive as a monarchy, the question arose to what extent the American Empire was compatible with a democracy in the long-term. Stabilization and consolidation of an empire required a rigid hierarchy, in which the world power politics of the United States collided with the domestic freedom of its citizens and therefore also with the democratic legitimization of its rulership.

Silke Wenk (University of Oldenburg) gave a paper on “Imperial Scenarios: The Iraq War in the visual media” with the aid of numerous photos of the US government’s image policy. Evocative individual images, such as President Bush’s appearance on the aircraft carrier USS Abraham Lincoln, where he used the military backdrop as an advertisement in May 2003 to announce the far-reaching end of the

clashes in Iraq, or the supposedly heroic rescue of American soldier Jessica Lynch from imprisonment in Iraq, were interpreted and placed in the appropriate political context. The aim of this was to show that the American administration of the time systematically staged expressive political moments and made use of the visual media to justify its government policy.

AG 1: Discourses

The Discourses workgroup concerned itself with the extent to which the various forms of the debate over empire reflect in each case differing domestic and international constellations both in the USA and in Europe. Lutz Schrader (FernUni Hagen) attached great importance to the fact that it was a question of political style, described as "imperial" and characterized by unilateralism supported by the military. It was viewed by its supporters as a positive thing for US-American interests, while critics viewed the USA as the original rogue state. Furthermore, empire was described as a form of world order policy, and the concept often used synonymously with hegemony.

Another point of view saw "imperialism" as a form of liberal-democratic world rulership, which granted democracies a right to intervene. The counter point of view stressed the dangers of such a policy for domestic stability and the democratic structure of the United States. The fourth and final point of view saw in "empire" a network of political, economic and cultural power centres and power structures, admittedly dominated by the USA, but functioning to the benefit of the whole OECD world, and in which Europe was also included.

The second paper was about neo-Marxist discourses on "empire". In her paper entitled "Control of the global favelas: On the state of world domestic policy" Sonja Buckel (University of Frankfurt/M.) described "empire" as a new form of global sovereignty, a type of rulership equal to the current globalization. It consisted of a global network of different institutions on the same state, economic and social level, geographically without limits and decentrally organized. Wars increasingly became police actions (although without police justice) to secure the "empire" against international criminal networks and zones that fall outside its government rules (so-called rogue states).

After a description of the (materialist) critique of the Hardt/Negri approach, which the speaker did not agree with in any case, her talk ended with remarks on how a global countervailing force might be constituted. As the "empire" was dominated by the USA, but as a "network" also included Europe, hopes would have to be pinned on an increasingly strong global network of civilian groups.

In his paper entitled " 'Empire' (really) or 'hegemony' (again)? What the hegemony theory can tell us about current US policy", Ingo Take (University of Greifswald) tried to explain the discussions about the USA's supremacy and its consequences for world order using the hegemony theory. The costs of an imperialist policy by the USA should prove too high and not be accepted by a self-occupied American public principally orientated towards economic advantage. Furthermore, the new threat from international terrorism could not be combatted primarily with military means but required world-wide cooperation in areas in which the USA did not hold the upper hand.

AG 2: Violence

In the first paper entitled "Model Wars in Afghanistan and Iraq? New concepts of waging war and their dissemination" Lutz Unterseher from the Studiengruppe Alternative Sicherheitspolitik (SAS, Berlin) first of all presented possible motives for intervention: besides controlling resources, the USA's political, economic and cultural power losses were clearly such that they might be compensated by deploying the military. The obvious contradiction in US foreign policy was, according to Unterseher, America's use of arms against states while it was at the same time talking about the "fight against international terror". In Unterseher's opinion, the Iraq war was more like a model because the justification for the war had been arbitrary. According to Unterseher there was a list of 40 countries in the USA in which a US intervention was not out of the question in the near future. Further wars of intervention by the USA thus had to be anticipated in the next few years.

In the second paper, Gerhard Piper from the Berliner Informationszentrum für transatlantische Sicherheitspolitik (BITS) spoke on "Geopolitics of the stationing of US troops". The USA operates 6,000 barracks in its own country and 700 overseas, however these stations with one or two exceptions are subject to no arms controls of any kind. Ac-

cording to Piper the US bases created after the Second World War fulfilled no primary defence of the realm duties, but instead provided an infrastructure for intervention. Piper claimed that the USA was pursuing the goal of stationing troops in every country with which a treaty had been agreed, so as to cement its global power. Local acceptance was crucial for the stationings – and at the same time this formed the starting point for possible actions by the world-wide peace movement.

The third paper in this workgroup entitled "The EU as an up-and-coming military power. Competition for or co-hegemony with the USA?" was given by Tobias Pflüger from the Informationsstelle Militarisierung (IMI) in Tübingen. He began with an analysis of the role of European countries, then elaborated in a second section the power-political background to the building of a European crisis reaction force, and finally turned his attention to the contents of the failed EU draft constitution relevant to military policy. In so doing Pflüger put forward the theory that the EU represented a competitor and a co-hegemony for the USA at the same time. The EU and the USA had identical approaches in two key areas: on the one hand to do with economic policy, as shown by the WTO negotiations in Cancun in which the EU took even stricter action than the USA. On the other, a similar strategy appeared to prevail in a military context, as both powers were developing structures for intervention and ideologically justifying this as "fighting for good".

The basic disagreement in the heated debate that followed the lecture was concerned with the empirical content of Pflüger's theory of the militarization of the EU. Pflüger interpreted the declaratory intention, while Unterseher and others used the reality of the troops and in particular their financial provision as the basis of their arguments.

AG 3: Economy

This workgroup concerned itself with the role and importance that should be attributed to the economy in an imperial world order. In his paper on "Hegemony of the 'Washington Consensus' in international trade and finance policy" Hartwig Hummel (University of Düsseldorf) tackled primarily the questions surrounding the mechanisms of hegemonial policy in current globalization processes. His first hypothesis was that the trade and finance policy of the Washington Con-

sensus was a result and strategy of a hegemonial political-economic world order, based on structural authoritative relationships. The hegemonial world order represented by the Washington Consensus – according to Hummel's second hypothesis – was currently in a situation of radical change with no clearly predictable outcome as yet. To back up his theories Hummel subjected globalization processes to a neo-Gramscian analysis.

Hegemony demanded a portrayal of real power and rulership relationships as both the only alternative and also beneficial for the (here global) wellbeing even of those being ruled. Resorting to physical military violence by powerful protagonists was according to Hummel from this point of view a sign of a hegemonial crisis.

In his concluding evaluation Hummel considered neither the implementation of an alternative social world economic order nor a long-term imperial position by the USA as likely. As the USA – unlike in the military field – did not by any means hold an unchallenged position of supremacy in the field of economy, it literally could not afford an imperial and protectionist policy long-term especially towards Europe.

In his paper on "Global Governance: Alternative or Hegemonial Strategy?" Ulrich Brand (Kassel) undertook a critical assessment of the global governance discourse. Global governance seemed to be a cooperatively designed and solution-orientated strategy under the impression of an impending imperial world order increasingly as an attractive and "peaceful" political alternative. This point of view had an opposing critical position which suspected global governance of being a modified hegemonial rulership strategy by western elites.

Brand admitted that global governance could lead to the creation of cooperative compromise-orientated patterns for problem solution, on which civilian protagonists might also be able to exercise (limited) influence. On the other hand in the discourse as a whole and also in practice, power imbalances between protagonists were airbrushed out. Furthermore the solutions to problems were geared primarily towards political-economic efficiency criteria. Thus global governance might well develop into a hegemonial discourse and also a hegemonial process, as criticism of existing relationships would first have to articulate itself through the prescribed channels.

AG 4: Justice

In workgroup AG 4 on justice, legal philosopher Reinhard Merkel (University of Hamburg) spoke first on "International law between imperial character and peace function" and – as illustrated by his sub-title – outlined the "Outlook after the preventive war in Iraq". Merkel laid out clearly the complex nature of the legitimacy of armed interventions, which imply a turning away from basic principles, and which inevitably have to collide. He differentiated between different principles of self-protection as possible reasons for violent intervention, which were only permissible in exceptional cases following strict criteria. In general a choice existed between a state's supporting or providing terror ("sponsoring" as in Afghanistan) and a country's incapability of ending terrorist activities. In the case of providing terror, the legitimization principle "self-defence" could be brought into force in an intervention, and in the incapability of ending terrorism one might refer to the legitimizing principle of defensive crisis.

Merkel predicted that Article 51 of the UN Charter, which provides for measures of individual and collective defence, would be gradually broadened to include criteria of defensive crisis. However, under the terms of current international law the threshold for humanitarian intervention was very high, so that the mere fact of mass governmental human rights abuses did not yet mean anything in the legitimization of a humanitarian intervention.

So the addition of the USA's reasons for war to justify their campaign in Iraq (defence against suspected weapons of mass destruction and liberation of the Iraqi people from tyranny as a humanitarian element) was inadequate and also not a candidate for ex post facto legitimization. For Merkel there was no legal obligation of any kind to intervene, other than at most a legitimate obligation as guarantor, which could not be compared with a moral-ethical obligation. The panel remarked with reason that a more complex picture could always be created after the event and that in the case of a purely academic legal argument possible political premises got a raw deal.

In the second paper on "The UN caught between being used as an imperial tool and asserting itself in terms of a peace policy" Martina Haedrich (University of Jena) noted selective and subtle changes with regard to issues of the normative development of collec-

tive security under international law. It was not a question of a fundamental change brought about by the war in Iraq. Instead, the actual subtle continued development – and here Haedrich agreed with Merkel – consisted in the fact that the inalienable right to collective and individual self-defence as stated in Article 51 of the UN Charter was gaining weight against Chapter 7. The USA, which referred to Article 51 in the case of interventions and on its own admission would take any action while on service, did not understand the objective criteria underlying the right to individual and collective self-defence. These were not to be compared with the right of the stronger party, but were governed by the principle of sovereign equality under the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

In contrast to media representation the role of the United Nations in the Iraq War was scarcely to be judged as weak in Haedrich's opinion, as the UN had not passed any war resolution and so had not forced international law to its knees. In her estimation, a Security Council mandate for the Iraq War would have been contrary to international law. Nowadays international law represented a horizontal right beside state activities, which did not occupy a higher rank than corresponding political decisions by national protagonists made on the basis of domestic law.

In the third paper on "The International Criminal Court – An institution between hope for peace and imperial world order" Tatjana Maikowski, employed at the Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia, predicted in the face of progress in recent years in the field of international jurisdiction that the International Criminal Court (ICC) would become a supporting pillar of the future peace order. The ICC with some 150 employees at present represented a permanent organization, unlike the Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia also located in The Hague, acting independently of the United Nations on the basis of a few multilateral agreements.

The ICC was only responsible in a supplementary capacity, so only took action under the subsidiarity principle, if domestic administration of justice did not ensure an appropriate punishment for serious war crimes. In Maikowski's opinion the refusal to ratify the court by the USA, China and India was all the more surprising in this context; all three major powers would appear to be seeking to obstruct a functional organ

Statement by the Vereinigung Deutscher Wissenschaftler (VDW) on the proposed reform of the German Armed Forces

In a statement on the proposed reform of the German Armed Forces, the Vereinigung Deutscher Wissenschaftler (VDW; author: Martina Fischer, Berlin) criticized course of the Federal Government's military policy, presented by Defence Minister Peter Struck at a press conference on 13 January 2004. In the words of Struck, strategic transfer capability, world-wide reconnaissance, and efficient and interoperable command and control systems must be created as a matter of priority, since the German Armed Forces might be deployed anywhere in the world.

In the opinion of the VDW the reduction and enclosure of conflict situations require first and foremost that measures and tools be created that are aimed at coping with the causes of these conflict situations. In its estimation, the German Armed Forces would be unable to make any substantial contribution as cause-orientated crisis prevention and conflict management belonged to the area of responsibility of development and foreign policy or peace and conflict research.

The creation of the infrastructure for civil conflict management was emphasized in the coalition agreement as an important goal by the red-green government in 1998. In the VDW's view the trend towards modernizing the German Armed Forces set in motion by the Federal Government is not compatible with this goal, as it includes no intention to disarm, but is based on the concept of re-equipment for further intervention and offensive capability. The VDW calls for the Federal Government to distance itself from an understanding of security dominated by the military and get to work on definite financial restructuring in favour of creating the civil tools for conflict management and crisis prevention and driving this forward within a European framework.

With regard to the deployment capabilities of the German Armed Forces in multinational terms and in terms of policy vis-à-vis their allies, the VDW found the Defence Minister's comments on 13 January confused, as although a prominent role would be assigned to the United Nations (UN) in coping with the challenges of the 21st century, there was no clearly declared belief in a UN monopoly on violence. Struck's statement contained no explicit declaration that foreign deployments of the German Armed Forces would be ordered only within the framework of currently valid international law and after authorization by the UN. The VDW calls on Struck to commit himself to ensuring that the new EU units serve the UN. Rather than making up ground in the area of military intervention capacities, the EU ought to take up independent peace policy initiatives in crisis regions, and in the face of the USA resolutely stand up for ensuring that the fight against terrorism takes place under the authority of the UN Security Council.

Contact: Vereinigung Deutscher Wissenschaftler (VDW), Schopenhauerstraße 26, 14129 Berlin, Germany, Tel.: +49-(0)-30-8030-8866, Fax: +49-30-8030-8888, email: info@vdw-ev.de, www.vdw-ev.de

of jurisdiction in The Hague. They were pursuing this strategy, although the establishment of this institution, by dint of its subsidiarity, was geared primarily towards non-functioning state apparatuses, i.e. towards "failed states" such as Somalia, the Congo or Uganda.

The USA itself, which had stood up strongly in favour of an international criminal jurisdiction, had according to Maikowski struck secret or openly bilateral agreements with more than 70 countries. These provided

for economic aid in exchange for an obligation to extradite US citizens being held in custody. Maikowski believed that this behaviour by the USA could only be explained through the understanding of sovereignty of a power-conscious state, which would prefer to retain its autonomy and all its options with regard to the consequences of serious war crimes committed by its own citizens.

Maikowski viewed as problematic the possible collision between United Nations policy and the ICC, which

insists upon the primacy of the law, if there were any question of a threat to world peace. Thus Milosevic was a negotiating partner for many years and must now answer for himself before the UN Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia. Article 16 of the Statute of Rome nonetheless provides for the UN Security Council's being able to request the ICC to adjourn its enquiries for a year, even in the absence of a concrete crisis situation. It is precisely the compromises made in the run-up to ratifying the Statute of Rome that increase the danger of abuse, instrumentalization and manipulation by strong states.

AG 5: Countervailing force

Workgroup AG 5 had as its objective to examine different sides of civilian resistance to the new world order or its effects. Jørgen Johansen of the Peace Centre at the University of Tromsø (Norway) spoke in his paper on "Peoples' Struggles: What chances do civilian resistance and social defence have in a unipolar world?" about the strategies and successes or failures of non-violent revolutions in the 20th century. Johansen made the main focus of his talk the role of the "masses" in irregular regime changes (i.e. not occurring as a result of an election or within the framework of the constitution) in which there was little or no violence. There was a long list of such non-violent revolutions for the 20th century, beginning with India in 1947 up to Georgia in 2003 as the most recent example. Fundamental strategies of non-violent revolution included non-cooperation and withdrawal of cooperation in various areas.

Johansen addressed various aspects and issues. The concept of non-violence was used to describe very different tangible goods and views, ranging from a refusal to use available weapons to a fundamental, mainly religiously motivated refusal to harm any living creature. Secondly there was the question of what represented success and how this was measured. Does the achievement of a change in regime count as success even if it is followed by corruption and renewed violence? This is very often the case, as those who are bringing about a coup d'état only rarely prepare themselves for the time when they are suddenly in the position of power. Johansen emphasized the necessity of such preparation, i.e. of what Gandhi and others called the Constructive Programme.

In her paper on "Civil conflict management and 'new wars'", ethnologist Sylvia Servaes, employed at Misereor

in Bonn, concerned herself with the tasks and challenges of development cooperation in the face of changes in the way wars are fought. She began her talk by asserting that countervailing force has to be built up vis-à-vis political or economic abuses of power of one of the declared objectives of (church) NGO development work. First of all Servaes gave a brief introduction of the characteristics of the “new wars”, before going on to present for discussion possible options and risks of the rise and maintenance of countervailing force or “peace from below” using one or two examples.

Concepts of clearly apparent delimitations, concepts of civil conflict management, striving towards an inclusive way of looking at conflict solutions with permanent win-win solutions for all parties, were increasingly beginning to waver, claimed Servaes. Nowadays the new wars appeared to be calling these concepts as a whole into question or at least measuring them up against new challenges. For the opponents were no longer a plainly defined state power or guerilla group with clear political demands, but militant groups of very differing composition, often with no great interest in an end to violence, since it is precisely from this violence that they draw their largest profit. The state monopoly on violence has according to Servaes given way to a use of force which defines the daily life of civilian population.

Historian Friedrike Habermann from the Global Action Network spoke on “Resistance from the belly of Moloch: should the new world order be foiled or reformed?” from the point of view that neither reform nor revolution were sufficient but that a hegemony-theoretical understanding of rulership was required in order to be able to create a “new world”. The alternatives political lobby or direct actions were discussed as much as reform or abolition of the institutions of the world economy. There was also the issue of the protagonists in resistance: the success of the protests in Seattle illustrated that resistance from the belly of Moloch was incomparably more powerful than from outside. As a result the danger of old hegemonies forming themselves anew existed even within the movement critical of globalization.

Panel discussion

In the panel discussion that took place the following day on the topic of “Imperial orders as reflected by concep-

tions of justice” Matthias Gillner (moral philosopher, German Armed Forces Command and Staff College, Hamburg) put forward the hypothesis that theories of international justice stood for a universal application of principles of justice. Gillner differentiates these theories with regard to the scope of their principles. Thus the liberalist theory puts the principle of self-preservation and free trade to the fore, whereas in distribution theories human vulnerability and need are core concerns. The idea of justice of distribution orientated towards equality on the other hand went even further analogous to the welfare state model in favour of a fair share for all in welfare profits.

Gillner pointed out that theories of international justice neglected the power structures of economy and civilization and were therefore blind to “soft factors” as he called them. The question remained open of the cultural appropriation of these theories on the one hand and of the right to difference on the other, that is of how universal standards should be pushed through without hegemony of civilization.

Tanja Brühl (junior professor, University of Frankfurt/M.) presented the economic dimension of justice. She pointed out that an exact definition of justice, which was in any case a social construct, was difficult because justice as a concept was always dependent on time and context. The problem of a global conception of justice, in which not only states but also individuals were at the focal point, was the lack of any shared global values base. In this respect procedural justice almost assumed a more important position than intrinsic justice.

However, in Brühl’s opinion, international institutions were not only establishing shared values and spinning an ever denser web of standards, but they were also cementing injustice, as it was possible to verify from the UN Millennium Declaration of 2000. Of the 18 stated goals, only two will be achieved by 2015, and of the poorest countries 54 are poorer than they were in 1990. Without procedural justice, there would be no justice of distribution, for which Tanja Brühl referred to the example of the World Bank, which guaranteed the USA a blocking minority with its 16 votes, whereas the developing countries’ share of the votes had sunk from 12 % to 2 % in the last few years. Long-term there was no alternative to the United Nations as a “fair” world organization. However,

it would have to get by structurally on too little money. Short-term, the NGOs would have to drain their critical potential and exert pressure on those in positions of responsibility.

In this context, Simone Wisotzki (scientific collaborator at the Peace Research Institute, Frankfurt) examined feminist conceptions of justice as a response to hegemonial order. Wisotzki ascertained a revival of traditional ideas about roles and a dividing into two of gender roles and called for continued unmasking of patriarchal orders. The speaker made the point that the present world order is based on a patriarchal power structure, and she found fault with the fact that existing theories of justice do not take account of gender. Women who were aware of structural gender inequalities showed those who held the reins of power a suitable strategy for realizing justice between the sexes, because international relations and the security field in particular were a male dominated domain. Thus feminist criticism attached itself to gender stereotypes at the level of action and demanded that they be dismantled. The objective should be to develop a strategy for universalization in the form of women’s human rights. A prerequisite was to perceive gender as an analytical category, so as to be able to establish a universal gender-mainstreaming in the long-term.

Peace Research in Germany

The conclusion of this colloquium sponsored by the Deutsche Stiftung Friedensforschung (DSF) was dedicated to the overall academic sponsorship and policy of the DSF. After a presentation of the structure and work of the DSF by its managing director Thomas Held, its president Volker Rittberger took questions from a panel of representatives of the individual AFK workgroups. These were primarily concerned with the barely sufficient means available for the foundation’s future sponsorship activities, and with aspects of content, for instance the topic of gender mainstreaming in projects, and queries about possible main focuses for sponsorship, in which the alternative, civilian management of crises and conflicts was set to be brought more to the forefront of sponsorship practice.

Workgroups

The initiative of a “Nachwuchs-AG” workgroup was the result of a discussion process among the AFK board of

directors on the possibilities for a broader sponsorship of young peace academics, as well as greater inclusion of interested students and PhD students in the working contexts of peace research and of the AFK. The following points were recorded as concrete results: firstly, the workgroup aims to concentrate on organizing a two-day conference for young academics planned for the end of 2004. This conference should offer young academics and students from different disciplines the opportunity to present the main emphases of their own work and research results relevant to peace research to an interested audience of young academics. The second main focus of the conference will be the creation of networking opportunities and sharing experiences for the purpose of career prospects in the field of peace research and peace policy.

The "Curriculum-AG" workgroup, which worked on curricular development of study courses for peace and conflict research in the early 1990s and which had not met as an independent group for many years because of the development of subsidiary and supplementary courses, has reformed itself. Undergraduate and graduate courses are being set up in Germany based on Anglo-Saxon models, which is viewed as both a problem and an opportunity in the academic world of peace studies. The Curriculum-AG workgroup will follow this development both critically and from an informed point of view, as well as setting its own priorities and investigating these possibilities in an initial specialist conference in July 2004 and elaborating options for action.

AFK Prize for Young Researchers

During the General Meeting the hard work of the judges' panel for the AFK Christiane Rajewsky Prize for Young Researchers was duly acknowledged, among other things. The five new or re-elected members of the judges' panel are: Hanne-Margret Birckenbach (University of Gießen), Chair; Tanja Brühl (University of Frankfurt/M.), Alfred Hirsch (Universität-GHS Duisburg-Essen) and Werner Ruf (em. University of Kassel).

During the colloquium the Christiane Rajewsky Prize for Young Researchers 2004, funded by the AFK to the tune of € 500, was awarded to Munich student Kassian Stroh, who had won the unanimous vote of the judges' panel with his Master's thesis entitled "Konflikt und Kooperation

um Wasser. Eine Fallstudie über den Nil" (Conflict and cooperation over water. A case study of the Nile). In the opinion of the judges the study of the conflict over this resource from the perspective of conflict theory was distinguished by stringently formulated arguments and an approach that was explicitly relevant to peace studies, as the considerable benefits from cooperation that might be won by the protagonists in the Nile conflict were brought out in a first class way.

General Meeting

At the AFK General Meeting the comprehensive board report commented on by old and new president Peter Schlotter (HSFK/PRIF) was passed by those present, as it documented a broad range of actions taken by the board in the field of academic policy and public work over the past two years. The fully committed reports by women's representative Ruth Stanley (FU Berlin) and AFK managing director Wilhelm Nolte (draft, Hamburg) were likewise enthusiastically received. A new board was elected and is now composed as follows: 1. President: Peter Schlotter (HSFK/PRIF), 2. President: Martina Fischer (Berghof Forschungszentrum Berlin), Committee members: Renate Grasse, Peter Imbusch, Wilhelm Nolte. Dieter Lünse (ikm, Hamburg) and Christian Wellmann (SCHIFF) were elected auditors. AFK's women members elected Simone Wisotzki (HSFK/PRIF) as the new women's representative.

*Dominic Raphael Schwickert,
University of Münster,
including workgroup reports by
Christine Schweitzer, Ralf Bendrath,
Björn Aust and Peter Schlotter*

Contact: Arbeitsgemeinschaft für Friedens- und Konfliktforschung e.V. (AFK), Geschäftsführung, Tönninger Weg 29, 22609 Hamburg, Germany, Tel.: +49-40-800-4178, email: afkgf@aol.com, www.afk-web.de.

Those interested in the "Nachwuchs-AG" are referred to the following address list: AFK-Nachwuchsgruppe@yahooroups.com, contact: Sascha Heylmann, sascha_heyermann@yahoo.de

Those interested in the "Curriculum-AG" are advised to contact the speakers: PD Dr. Peter Imbusch, imbusch@staff.uni-marburg.de; and Prof. Dr. Tanja Brühl, bruehl@soz.uni-frankfurt.de

Notices & Reports

Germany: Web site on arms control and disarmament issues

As of 2003 a new German-language web site has been set up (www.ArmsControl.de), within the framework of the project entitled "Zukunft der Rüstungskontrolle" (future of arms control) funded by the Berghof Foundation. The web site regroups a large number of resources to do with arms control and disarmament issues. It contains not only brief introductory articles on topics such as nuclear or conventional arms control, nuclear disarmament, antimissile defence, weapons in space or the "Revolution in Military Affairs", but also list of related documentation and home-produced publications and a comprehensive list of links to arms-related topics. Besides texts on the most important arms control treaties, the web site focuses on scientific and technical issues to do with arms control.

The www.ArmsControl.de project aims to contribute towards initiating and driving forward the debate on the future of arms control. Issues tackled include what prospects there are for a homogenous framework or higher principles governing arms control in the future, and whether it is possible to push the subject into the broader discussion forum of the public domain and make practical proposals to policy-makers.

Contact: Institut für Friedensforschung und Sicherheitspolitik an der Universität Hamburg (IFSH), Interdisziplinäre Forschungsgruppe Abrüstung, Rüstungskontrolle (IFAR), Dr. Götz Neuneck: neuneck@public.uni-hamburg.de, Tel: +49-40-866-077-21, Christian Mölling: christianmoelling@web.de, Tel: +49-40-866-077-70

International: Resources for Peace

The Resources for Peace Web Page, under the slogan "We give wings to your ideas", has moved to www.givewings.com. The web site aims to present alternatives to war and violence, and contains publications on this subject and a comprehensive list of links to peace and justice organizations and their work, as well as commentaries and a list of recommended films.

Contact: GiveWings, 141 W. Harvey St., Philadelphia, PA 19144, USA, Tel.: +1-215-849-4941, email: rasphila@givewings.com, www.givewings.com/peace

Denmark: Danish Institute for International Studies (DIIS)

On 1 January 2003, the peace research institute COPRI in Copenhagen merged with the Danish Institute for International Affairs, the Centre for Development Research and the Danish Centre for Holocaust and Genocide Research to form the Danish Institute for International Studies (DIIS). The DIIS is part of the Danish Centre for International Studies and Human Rights and was established by Act of Parliament in 2002 with the aim of strengthening research activities in the fields of development, foreign and security policy, genocide and human rights policy in Denmark and abroad. The most recent report by COPRI (2002/40), "COPRI: Final Report 1985-2002", lists all COPRI publications, staff and major projects of recent years and can be obtained from the contact given below.

Contact: Danish Institute for International Studies (DIIS), Strandgade 56, 1401 Copenhagen K, Denmark, Tel +45-3269-8787, Fax +45-3269-8800, email: hwi@diis.dk, www.diis.dk

Great Britain: South East European Studies Programme (SEESP)

The South East European Studies Programme (SEESP) was established in 2002 as part of the European Studies Centre at Oxford University. The main focus of the programme is on analysing politics and social relationships in South East Europe and the Balkans, concentrating on regional developments in the context of relationships with the European Union and the Cyprus conflict. A feature of the programme is the foundation of a Greco-Turkish network (GTN) by means of joint conferences, workshops and research seminars, as well as the exchange policy papers and academic publications.

The SEESP has scheduled a public conference for 21 May 2004, entitled "Greek-Turkish rapprochement", which will follow a one-day workshop for network members. As a result of this two-day event, a policy paper with recommendations for both countries will be published, along with a book entitled "Greek-Turkish Rapprochement: Assessing the Peace Building Process, 1999-2004".

Contact: Dr. Othon Anastasakis, South East European Studies Programme (SEESP), European Studies Centre St

Antony's College, Oxford OX2 6JF, Great Britain, Tel.: +44-1865-284-761, Fax: +44-1865-274-478, email: othon.anastasakis@sant.ox.ac.uk, www.sant.ox.ac.uk/areastudies/southeasteur.shtm

USA: Human Security - Publication and Summer School

• Publication

In 1994 the United Nations reacted to increasing insecurity in public and private provision within the framework of growing economic globalization and privatization of public assets with the concept of Human Security. This includes access to education, health, financial stability, an unharmed environment, no worries about food, fight against poverty, and a secure labour market and employment. Furthermore, the concept emphasized protection against domestic and war violence, and the removal of the causes of insecurity for the most vulnerable members of a society. The concept of Human Security is based on an integral approach which does not reduce security to military security at state level, but defines it as a lasting concept orientated towards human beings.

The 1998 Nobel prizewinner for economics, Amartya Sen, who chairs an independent UN commission on Human Security with former UN refugee representative Sadako Ogata, produced a "Final Report of the Commission on Human Security" in May 2003, in which he presented suitable tools for expanding the present paradigm of a one-sided military security in favour of a more comprehensive concept in which human security is defined in psychological, social, political, economic and environmentally friendly terms. The entire report can be consulted in English at www.humansecurity-chs.org/finalreport

• Summer School

The International Institute on Peace Education (IIPE) is taking place this year at Sabanci University in Istanbul (Turkey). The IIPE was founded in 1982 by the Peace Education Center of Teachers College at Columbia University in New York and has since been held annually as a summer school in various parts of the world.

IIPE 2004 will focus on the concept of "human security" as a means for creating an all-encompassing culture of peace. Lack of human security is after all the cause and consequence of many conflicts in the Middle East, the Balkans and the Caucasus. Educators and policy-makers must confront a culture of conflict, which engenders prejudices and hatred,

with appropriate concepts and strategies. These will be elaborated in more detail during this summer school by workers in the field of peace studies from all over the world. The conference fee is \$450, which includes overnight accommodation, board and local transportation. Since places are limited, applications should be submitted as soon as possible.

Contact: Peace Education Center, Teachers College, Box 171 Columbia University New York, New York 10027, USA, Tel.: +1-212-678-8116 Fax: +1-212-678-8237, www.tc.edu/PeaceEd

International: Bulletin of Regional Cooperation in the Middle East

From autumn 2003 the Search for Common Ground in the Middle East and the European Centre for Common Ground will be publishing their Bulletin of Regional Cooperation in the Middle East only online. The money that this will save will enable them to produce the online Bulletin in Hebrew and Arabic, besides English, so that it will reach as large an audience as possible in the crisis regions of the Middle East. The Bulletin can be accessed at www.sfcg.org/bulletin.htm. In order to subscribe to the online Bulletin in English, send an email to: subscribe-bulletinenglish@sfcg.org; to subscribe to the Arabic edition, email: subscribe-bulletinarabic@sfcg.org; and to subscribe to the Hebrew edition, email: subscribe-bulletinhebrew@sfcg.org

Contact: Bulletin of Regional Cooperation in the Middle East, 1601 Connecticut Ave. N.W., Suite 200, Washington, DC 20009-1035, USA, Tel.: +1-202-265-4300, Fax: +1-202-232-6718, email: mideast@sfcg.org, www.sfcg.org/bulletin.htm

Germany: Bonn International Center for Conversion (BICC)

With the study entitled "Confronting Afghanistan's Security Dilemma: Security Sector Reform", the Bonn International Center for Conversion presents the results of the internet conference on "Afghanistan: Assessing the progress of security sector reform, one year after the Geneva conference" as a further publication in the "brief" series. More than 100 people from various international organizations, NGOs, research institutes, representatives from aid-giving countries and

Afghanistan's interim government took part in this internet dialogue, which the BICC organised in June as part of its project entitled "Monitoring Afghan security sector reform". The conference focused on three aspects of the security sector reform, formally agreed upon in April 2002 at the aid-giving conference in Geneva: reform of the military; reform of the police force; and the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of former combatants. BICC's "brief 28" published at the end of 2003 gives an overview of the security situation in Afghanistan, analyses the current status of reform efforts and discusses strategies for reforming the security sector.

Contact: Bonn International Center for Conversion (BICC), An der Elisabethkirche 25, 53113 Bonn, Germany, Tel.: +49-228-911 96-0, Fax: +49-228-241-215, email: bicc@bicc.de, www.bicc.de

Germany: Civil Conflict Management in Theory and Practice

The study entitled "Civil Conflict Management in Theory and Practice" (written by Sabine Klotz) in the "Texte und Materialien der FEST" series discusses the potential for and limitations on civil, i.e. non-military, intervention in political conflicts which seem likely to escalate or have already escalated into a (civil) war. The author takes as her case study the activities of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) and German non-governmental peace services in the countries which succeeded former Yugoslavia.

The study sets out the different stages of political conflicts conducted in a violent way and examines how local and non-local protagonists in a crisis region relate to one another. It also covers the recruitment and qualification criteria for both groups of protagonists and evaluates the desirable and undesirable effects of civil conflict management. The publication is addressed at all those interested in the issue of whether civil and other wars might be prevented or brought to an end by external protagonists and peace promoted by peaceful means, and which materials would be needed to do this.

Contact: Sabine Klotz M.A., Forschungsstätte der Evangelischen Studiengemeinschaft e.V., Schmeilweg 5, 69118 Heidelberg, Germany, Tel.: +49-6221-912-20, Fax: +49-6221-167-257

Great Britain: Conciliation Resources (CR)

Conciliation Resources (CR) has published a new issue in the series entitled "Alternatives to war: Colombia's peace processes". It presents the situation in Colombia, a country torn apart by 40 years of ongoing armed conflict and still marked by violence and humanitarian crises today. The issue provides an introduction to the peace-making efforts of three decades and presents the work of those working at local, regional and national levels. It also documents not only the highlights of formal peace processes with the guerrilla groups but also the obstacles encountered in the peace-making process. The aim is to illustrate the importance of learning from past peace-making efforts for future conflict resolution models, so as to avoid repeating mistakes. Besides articles on the challenges and dilemmas in the Colombian peace-making process, explanations of individual reforms and regional initiatives, a representation of US policy and the role of the international community in Colombia, there is a chronology of the peace process with all the key peace agreements and profiles of the main protagonists.

Contact: Accord Marketing, Conciliation Resources, 173 Upper Street, London N1 1RG, UK, email: accord@c-r.org, www.c-r.org/accord/col/accord14/index.shtml

International: European Association of Development Research and Training Institutes (EADI) online

The new EADI web site is online at www.eadi.org and now features a news section and a smart search engine that leads users directly to topic-related pages. The EADI is an independent international non-government organization addressing key issues in development research. It encompasses an active network of 150 organizations.

Contact: Susanne von Itter, Assistant Executive Secretary, Kaiser-Friedrich-Straße 11, 53113 Bonn, Germany, Tel.: 49-228-261-8101, Fax: 49-228-261-8103, email: itter@eadi.org, www.eadi.org

Austria: Austrian Study Centre for Peace and Conflict Resolution

The Austrian Study Centre for Peace and Conflict Resolution (Österreichisches Studienzentrum für Frieden und

Konfliktlösung, ÖSFK) has issued a new publication entitled "Schurkenstaat und Staatsterrorismus - Die Konturen einer militärischen Globalisierung" (Rogue state and state terrorism - the shape of military globalization). The book consists of different sections by various authors. The first section looks at dealing with "rogue states" in the future world order, with particular reference to the situation in Iraq, and at transatlantic conflict relating to a military hegemony. The second section contains a study of wars in the post-modern era, putting human rights, the role of the media and environmental policy on the test stand. The third section is devoted to the tense relationship between religion and violence and investigates the extent to which it might be possible to get closer to a culture of non-violence by using religion. The fourth and fifth sections contain an analysis of the relation of economics and war and the dynamics of global social forums and other social movements.

Contact: Außenstelle Wien des Österreichischen Studienzentrums für Frieden und Konfliktlösung, Wiedner Gürtel 10, 1040 Wien, Austria, Tel.: +43-1-7969-959, Fax: +43-1-7965-711, email: aspr.vie@aspr.ac.ac, www.aspr.ac.at/asprvie/aussenstelle_wien.htm

Germany: Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ)

A paper entitled "Orientierungsrahmen für Friedensfonds" (reference guidelines for peace funds) published by the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ, a government-owned corporation for international cooperation with world-wide operations) gives an overview of the possibilities and limitations of setting up a fund in the field of peace development as the constituent of a regional portfolio. It goes on to illustrate, with reference to experiences with numerous peace funds in various regions, the measures which have proved to be successful at implementation level when setting up a fund.

The paper mainly addresses those working in German development cooperation, who influence portfolio decisions at the level of political strategy. It is also addressed at those in charge of projects at implementation level. The aim is to show that the strength of a peace fund as a key instrument of development cooperation for crisis

prevention and peace building lies in the speed and flexibility of financial backing and advice on innovative pilot-type measures and in reinforcement from peace-orientated individuals.

Contact: Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ) GmbH, Dag-Hammarskjöld-Weg 1-5, Postfach 5180, 65726 Eschborn, Germany, Tel.: +49-6196-79-0, www.gtz.de/crisisprevention

Germany: German Institute for Human Rights

In collaboration with the German division of amnesty international, the Ludwig-Boltzmann Institute for Human Rights in Vienna and the Institute for Development and Peace in Duisburg, the German Institute for Human Rights has published the "Jahrbuch Menschenrechte" (Human Rights Yearbook). This the sixth edition focuses on the realization of human rights in Europe against the backdrop of the expansion of the European Union. Proven experts pick out as their central theme the dynamics of change in the prospective member states, which in human rights terms have been triggered off by the prospects of EU membership. The EU Convention on the creation of a European Constitution is also studied.

The investigation begun in "Jahrbuch Menschenrechte 2003" is continued into the compatibility of strategies to combat terrorism, taking human rights as universal legal tender. The main focus is on political analyses, and analyses taking into account international law, of the new American security doctrine and on the war against Iraq. The issue also includes various articles on the International Criminal Court and on the human rights situation in Germany, an overview of the stages currently reached towards ratification by key human rights agreements, and human rights prizes awarded in Germany.

Contact: Deutsches Institut für Menschenrechte, Zimmerstr. 26/27, 10969 Berlin, Germany, Tel. +49-30-259-359-0, email: info@institut-fuer-menschenrechte.de, www.institut-fuer-menschenrechte.de

Germany: Stiftung Entwicklung und Frieden I

The seventh edition in the series entitled "Globale Trends 2004/2005" issued by the Stiftung Entwicklung und Frieden (SEF) once more puts together facts, figures and con-

texts for current global development trends in the international community along with analyses of the same. This new edition updates the central chapters of earlier editions and takes up new topics such as the crisis in transatlantic relations and the "unipolar moment" in world politics.

Ten theses on the Iraq war as a caesura in world politics are given precedence in this edition over the four sectional analyses and individual articles on "international community", "world economy", "global ecology" and "world politics and world peace". In the face of the unilateralism of the US hegemony the three editors, Ingo-Mar Hauchler, Dirk Messner and Franz Nuscheler, call for Europe to formulate a world policy agenda of its own and call upon the EU to make significant contributions to solving key global problems. The other articles nonetheless also make concrete recommendations for action in national and international politics.

Contact: Stiftung Entwicklung und Frieden (SEF), Development and Peace Foundation, Gotenstr. 152, 53175 Bonn, Germany, Tel.: +49-228-95925-0, Fax: +49-228-95925-99, email: sef@sef-bonn.org, www.sef-bonn.org

Germany: Stiftung Entwicklung und Frieden II

Volume 16, entitled "Krieg als (Über)lebenswelten - Schattenglobalisierung, Kriegsökonomien und Inseln der Zivilität" (War as (survival) habitat – shadow globalization, war economies and islands of civility), has just been published in the series "EINE Welt - Texte der Stiftung Entwicklung und Frieden". The new volume illustrates the connection between war and economic motivations for individual protagonists who have been involved in making wars happen. The first section of the work deals with shadow globalization (i.e. in the informal economy), global economy and statehood, in which the main focus is on the transformation of war in an age of globalization. The second section handles causes, material foundations and the crossing of national boundaries in current wars. Studies highlight profit-seeking and armed violence in India and migration and diaspora in Afghanistan. This section also contains examples of the economy of domestic wars, of horizontal inequalities as causes of civil wars and the role of hijackings in international conflicts.

The third section describes the subject matter from the point of view of the violent protagonists and their victims. War and armed conflicts are considered as so-

cial space here and analysed as such. The connection between youth, Islam and violence in Algeria is studied, as is child labour in the drugs cartels of Rio de Janeiro. The fourth and final section sheds light on possible building blocks for stabilization. These include the relationship between the military and humanitarian aid in international crises, the role of the peacetime economy and international law, and the implications of Private Military Companies in violent conflicts. The influence of the "peace industry" on conflict situations is also elaborated by way of Northern Ireland as an example.

Contact: Stiftung Entwicklung und Frieden (SEF), Gotenstr. 152, 53175 Bonn, Germany, Tel.: +49-228-95925-0, Fax: +49-228-95925-99, email: sef@sef-bonn.org, www.sef-bonn.org

Germany: Stiftung Entwicklung und Frieden III

Volume 17 of the series "EINE Welt - Texte der Stiftung Entwicklung und Frieden", entitled "Nation-Building - Ein Schlüsselkonzept für friedliche Konfliktbearbeitung?" (Nation building – a key concept for peaceful conflict management; editor: Jochen Hippler), contains concepts and theoretical analyses of nation building. It illustrates the backgrounds to conflict prevention and nation building, as well as discussing the relation between nation building on the one hand and globalization and democratization on the other.

Using various case studies, these concepts are compared with political reality in a second section. Examples include nation building in Afghanistan in the shadow of the warlords and the War against Terrorism, nation building based on military occupation in Iraq, and also events in Somalia, Bosnia, Nigeria and Kosovo. A third section paints a more detailed picture of nation building in political practice from the perspective of development and security policy. The role of non-government organizations in nation building processes is elaborated and this strategy for regional stabilization and conflict prevention discussed along with options and limitations for external military intervention.

Contact: Stiftung Entwicklung und Frieden (SEF), Gotenstr. 152, 53175 Bonn, Germany, Tel.: +49-228-95925-0, Fax: +49-228-95925-99, email: sef@sef-bonn.org, www.sef-bonn.org

Germany: Conflict & Communication Online

The journal conflict & communication online has set itself the task of bringing about a dialogue between the varied academic viewpoints and professional experiences of social-science, intellectual and cultural disciplines and spheres of practical application in the fields of conflict and communication. This dialogue aims to reach beyond the topical study of current fields of conflict and set up basic research in peace studies. The spectrum spans social-psychological small-group research to the investigation of wars within and between states; the analysis of interpersonal communication to research into mass communication; and conflict management to journalism and new forms of information technology.

The online journal will include theoretical articles and the results of empirical research, methodological discussions and practical reflections, reports on experiences and contributions on problem areas. Manuscripts can be submitted in English or German. Manuscripts will be accepted exclusively on the merit of their quality and topical relevance. Due to the cross-disciplinary nature of its subject matter, this will often mean that conflict & communication online will publish articles that would have had only a limited chance of publication in the usual mainstream journals. Each edition of the journal will be devoted half to a specific focus topic and half to a variety of different contributions. The focus topic of the April 2004 edition is the role of the media as mediators in peace building and democratization of post-war societies.

Contact: Prof. Dr. Wilhelm Kempf, Universität Konstanz, Fachbereich Psychologie, 78457 Konstanz, Germany, Tel.: +49-7531-88-2564, email: cco@regener-online.de, www.cco.regener-online.de

Germany: Ministerium für Wissenschaft und Forschung des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen

The ministry for science and research in the German state of North Rhine-Westphalia has brought out a comprehensive calendar of events in the shape of the Wissenlive web site (www.wissenlive.nrw.de) aimed at inhabitants of North Rhine-Westphalia who take a general interest in science and research. They can use it to search

for the major scientific lectures, excursions and events on a single site. Event organizers can post the details of their events online at <http://termine.mwfnrw.de> free of charge in hardly any time. In future, the Wissenlive site will be linked to other related services such as "Wissenschaft: im Dialog" and "Informationsdienst Wissenschaft (idw)", so as to publicize the calendar beyond the region.

Contact: Ministerium für Wissenschaft und Forschung des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen, Referat für Kommunikation, Völklinger Straße 49, 40221 Düsseldorf, Germany, Tel.: +49-211-896-4670, Fax: +49-211-896-4675, email: axel.weber@mwf.nrw.de, www.wissenlive.nrw.de, for queries or comments: wissenlive@mwf.nrw.de

German Peace Research Publications in English

Austrian Study Center for Peace and Conflict Resolution (ed.), *Constructive Conflict Coverage. A Social Psychological Approach*, Berlin 2003. 191 pp.

Bauer, Norbert L., *African Regional Integration- The EU-SA Free Trade Agreement* (University of Leipzig: Papers on Africa No.71- Politics and Economics, Leipzig 2004), 34 pp.

Brauch/Liotta/Marquina/Rogers/Selim (eds.), *Security and Environment in the Mediterranean-Conceptualising Security and Environmental Conflict* (AG Friedensforschung und Europäische Sicherheitspolitik, Hexagon Series No.1; Collection Strademed No.16, Berlin/Heidelberg/New York 2003), 1162 pp.

Birkenbach, Hanne-Margret/Wellmann, Christian (eds.), *The Kaliningrad Challenge-Options and Recommendations* (The Schleswig-Holstein Institute for Peace Research: Kiel Peace Research Series Volume 10, Lit Verlag Münster/Hamburg/Berlin/London 2003), 298 pp.

Ishengoma, Esther, *The Role of Firm Resources: Performance Differentials between Women- and Men-owned Microenterprises in Tanzania* (Uni-

versity of Leipzig: Papers on Africa No.70 - Politics and Economics, Leipzig 2004), 31 pp.

Kitschelt, Herbert, *State Failure, Globalization, and Regime Conflict: Origins of Contemporary International Terrorism in the Middle East* (Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung: International Policy Analysis Unit, Bonn 2003), 31 pp.

Klein, Uta, *The Gender Perspective of Civil-Military Relations in Israeli Society*, in: *Current Sociology*, Volume 50, Number 5, Münster 2002, pp. 669-686.

Krell, Gert, *Arrogance of Power- Arrogance of Impotence. The Iraq Conflict, US "Weltpolitik", and Transatlantic Relations* (Peace Research Institute Frankfurt: PRIF Reports No.67, Frankfurt 2003), 45 pp.

Matveeva, Anna, *Macedonia: Guns, policing and ethnic division* (Saferworld and Bonn International Center for Conversion, London/Bonn 2003), 71 pp.

Matveeva, Anna/Paes, Wolf-Christian, *The Kosova Serbs: An ethnic minority between collaboration and defiance* (Bonn International Center for Conversion, Friedrich Naumann Foundation and Saferworld, Bonn/Belgrade/London 2003), 56 pp.

Paffenholz, Thania, *Community-based Bottom-up Peacebuilding. The development of the Life and Peace Institute's approach to peacebuilding and Lessons Learned from the Somalian experience (1990-2000)* (The Life and Peace Institute Uppsala/Nairobi: Horn of Africa Series, Uppsala 2003).

Spanger, Hans-Joachim/Wolff, Jonas, *Poverty Reduction through Democratisation? PRSP: Challenges of a New Development Assistance Strategy* (Peace Research Institute Frankfurt: PRIF Reports No.66, Frankfurt 2003), 45 pp.

Wills, Oliver, *War Veterans and Peacebuilding in Former Yugoslavia - A Pilot Project of the Centre for Nonviolent Action (CNA)*, (Berghof Research Center for Constructive Conflict Management, Berghof Occasional Paper Number 24, Berlin 2004), 36 pp.

Winn, Neil (ed.), *Special Issue on Neo-Medievalism and Civil Wars*, (Civil Wars, Volume 6, Number 2, o.O. 2003), pp.70-93.

The following publications were received or purchased by the AFB office between September 2003 and February 2004 and may be consulted in the AFB reference library.

Peace Research/ Basic Research Civil Conflict Resolution

Botes, Johannes: Conflict Transformation: A Debate over Semantics or a Crucial Shift in the Theory and Practice of Peace and Conflict Studies? In: International Journal of Peace Studies, Vol. 8, No. 2/2003, S. 1 - 27.

Chojnacki, Sven: Demokratien und Krieg. Das Konfliktverhalten demokratischer Staaten im internationalen System, 1946-2001. Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung: discussion papers 304/2003, 42 S.

Friedensentwicklung (Hg.): Netzwerk- und Akteursanalyse. Ein methodischer Leitfaden. Draft 12. September 2003. Bonn 2003, 16 S.

Held, Thomas: Förderprogramme Friedensforschung. Bilanz und Perspektiven der DSF. In: Wissenschaft und Frieden, 21. Jg. 4/2003, S. 6 - 10.

Hippler, Jochen (Hg.): Nation-Building. Ein Schlüsselkonzept für friedliche Konfliktbearbeitung? Stiftung Entwicklung und Frieden: Bonn 2004, 276 S.

Plattform Zivile Konfliktbearbeitung (Hg.): Frieden braucht Gesellschaft! Gesellschaftliche Ansätze in der Zivilen Konfliktbearbeitung. Eine Bestandsaufnahme. Bonn 2003, 80 S.

Rittberger, Volker: Herausforderungen für die Friedensforschung am Beginn des 21. Jahrhunderts. In: Die Friedenswarte, Bd 78, 2-3/2003, S. 235 - 250.

Sahm, Astrid/Sapper, Manfred/Weichsel, Volker (Hg.): Die Zukunft des Friedens. Eine Bilanz der Friedens- und Konfliktforschung: Westdeutscher Verlag: Wiesbaden 2002, 434 S.

Stiftung Entwicklung und Frieden: Global Trends 2004/2005. Fakten Analysen Prognosen. Fischer Verlag: Frankfurt/ M. 2003, 347 S.

Verband Entwicklungspolitik deutscher Nichtregierungsorganisationen (Hg.): Armutsbekämpfung und Krisenprävention. Wie lässt sich Armutsbekämpfung konflikt sensitiv gestalten? Bonn 2003, 43 S.

Wissenschaft und Frieden: Schwerpunkt Friedensforschung. 21.Jg., 4/2003, 75 S.

OSCE/Europe

Biermann, Frank/Sohn, Hans-Dieter: Europa und eine multipolare Weltordnungspolitik. Indien und Ostasien als neue Bündnispartner? Stiftung Entwicklung und Frieden: Policy Paper 21/2003, Bonn, 11 S.

Loquai, Heinz: Weichenstellungen für einen Krieg. Internationales Krisenmanagement und die OSZE im Kosovo-Konflikt. Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft: Baden-Baden 2003, 201 S.

Neukirch, Claus: Konfliktmanagement und Konfliktprävention im Rahmen von OSZE-Langzeitmissionen. Eine Analyse der Missionen in Moldau und Estland. Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft: Baden-Baden 2003, 333 S.

Oğuzlu, H. Tarik: An Analysis of Turkey's Prospective Membership in the European Union from a "Security" Perspective. In: Security Dialogue, Vol. 34, No. 3/2003, S. 285 - 299.

Rittberger, Volker/Zelli, Fariborz: Europa in der Weltpolitik: Juniorpartner der USA oder antihegemoniale Alternative? In: Die Friedenswarte, Bd 78, 2-3/2003, S. 195 - 233.

Stiftung Entwicklung und Frieden (Hg.). Eine europäische Sicherheitsstrategie. Fiktion oder Fundament einer effektiven gemeinsamen Außen- und Sicherheitspolitik? SEF News 18/2003, Bonn, 15 S.

North-South Relations Development

Brock-Utne, Birgi: The Language Question in Africa in the Light of Globalisation, Social Justice and Democracy. In: International Journal of Peace Studies, Vol. 8, No. 2/2003, S. 67 - 87.

Faath, Sigrid (Hg.): Islamische Stiftungen und wohltätige Einrichtungen mit entwicklungspolitischen Zielsetzungen in arabischen Staaten. Deutsches Orient-Institut: Hamburg 2003, 249 S.

Rae, James: War Crimes Accountability: Justice and Reconciliation in Cambodia and East Timor? In: Global Change, Peace & Security, Vol. 15, No. 2/2003, S. 157 - 178.

Verband Entwicklungspolitik deutscher Nichtregierungsorganisationen (Hg.): Zivilgesellschaft & Entwicklung 2003. Bonn 2003, 34 S.

Walzer, Michael: Liberalism and Global Inequality. The Joan B. Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies: Peace Colloquy 4/2003, S. 14 - 15.

Conflicts & Crises Wars & Causes of War

Dodge, Toby: US Intervention and possible Iraqi Futures. In: The International Institute for Strategic Studies: Survival, Vol. 45, No. 3/2003, S. 103 - 122.

Duisburger Institut für Sprach- und Sozialforschung (Hg.): Sonderheft Irak-Krieg 2003. DISS-Journal/kultuRRevolution: Duisburg 2003, 40 S.

Fisk, Robert: This Looming War isn't about Chemical Warheads or Human Rights: It's about Oil. In: Peace Research, Vol. 35, No. 1/2003, S. 21 - 24.

Kempin, Tina: Ready for Peace? The Implementation of the Good Friday Agreement in Northern Ireland 1998-2002. Forschungsstelle für Sicherheitspolitik der ETH Zürich: Zürcher Beiträge zur Sicherheitspolitik und Konfliktforschung Nr. 68/2003, 170 S.

Kitschelt, Herbert: State Failure, Globalization, and Regime Conflict: Origins of Contemporary International Terrorism in the Middle East. Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung: Bonn 2003, 31 S.

Krawitz, Howard M.: Resolving Korea's Nuclear Crisis: Tough Choices for China. Institute for National Strategic Studies/National Defense University: Washington, Strategic Forum No. 201/2003, 6 S.

Mason, Ann: Colombia's Democratic Security Agenda: Public Order in the Security Tripod. In: Security Dialogue, Vol. 34, No. 4/2003, S. 391 - 409.

Reeb, Hans-Joachim: Berichterstattung vom Golf. Reflexionen über den Journalismus im Irak-Krieg 2003. Führungsakademie der Bundeswehr, Hamburg: SOW kontrovers Nr. 1/2003, 52 S.

Schaffer, Teresita C.: Finding a Kashmir Settlement: The Burden of Leadership. Institute for National Strategic Studies/National Defense University: Washington, Strategic Forum No. 199/2003, 4 S.

Schlicher, Monika/Flor, Axel: Osttimor - Konfliktlösung durch die Vereinten Nationen. In: Die Friedenswarte, Bd 78, 2-3/2003, S. 251 - 279.

International Law & the United Nations Human Rights and International Relations

Beestermöller, Gerhard (Hg.): Die humanitäre Intervention - Imperativ der Menschenrechtsidee? Rechtsethische Reflexionen am Beispiel des Kosovo-Krieges. Kohlhammer: Stuttgart 2003, 171 S.

Bunn, M. Elaine: Preemptive Action: When, How, and to what Effect? Institute for National Strategic Studies/National Defense University: Washington, Strategic Forum No. 200/2003, 8 S.

Deutsches Institut für Menschenrechte (Hg.): Menschenrechte 2004. Suhrkamp: Frankfurt/M. 2003, 369 S.

Ehrke, Michael: Nach dem Irak-Krieg: Unipolarität und Globalisierung. Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung: Bonn 2003, 8 S.

Follmar-Otto, Petra/Cremer, Hendrik: Das neue Zusatzprotokoll zur UN-Anti-Folter-Konvention. Herausforderungen für die deutsche Innenpolitik. Deutsches Institut für Menschenrechte: Policy Paper 2/2004, 10 S.

Ham, Peter van: War, Lies, and Videotape: Public Diplomacy and the USA's War on Terrorism. In: Security Dialogue, Vol. 34, No. 4/2003, S. 427 - 444.

Herman, Michael: Intelligence After 9/11: A British View of the Effects. Canadian Security Intelligence Service: Commentary 83/2003, 16 S.

Lutz, Dieter S. †/Gießmann, Hans J. (Hg.): Die Stärke des Rechts gegen das Recht des Stärkeren. Politische und rechtliche Einwände gegen eine Rückkehr des Faustrechts in die internationalen Beziehungen. Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft: Baden-Baden 2003, 430 S.

Massachusetts Institute of Technology/Security Studies Program (Ed.): Annual Report 2002-2003. Cambridge 2003, 51 S.

Morden, Reid: Spies, not Soothsayers: Canadian Intelligence after 9/11. Canadian Security Intelligence Service: Commentary 85/2003, 14 S.

Rupprecht, Johanna: Frieden durch Menschenrechtsschutz. Strategien der Vereinten Nationen zur Verwirklichung der Menschenrechte weltweit.

Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft: Baden-Baden 2003, 363 S.

Sale, Richard: Saddam-CIA Links (1959-1990). In: Peace Research, Vol. 35, No. 1/2003, S. 17 - 20.

Treverton, Gregory F.: Reshaping Intelligence to Share with "Ourselves". Canadian Security Intelligence Service: Commentary 82/2003, 8 S.

Turner, Scott: The Dilemma of Double Standards in U.S. Human Rights Policy. In: Peace & Change, Vol. 28, No. 4/2003, S. 524 - 554.

Security Policy & Armament Arms Conversion

Auswärtiges Amt: Bericht zur Rüstungskontrolle, Abrüstung und Nichtverbreitung 2002. Berlin 2003, 115 S.

Bellamy, Alex J.: Security Sector Reform: Prospects and Problems. In: Global Change, Peace & Security, Vol. 15, No. 2/2003, S. 101 - 119.

Bohlen, Avis: The Rise and Fall of Arms Control: In: The International Institute for Strategic Studies: Survival, Vol. 45, No. 3/2003, S. 7 - 34.

Borsuk, Gerald M./Coffey, Timothy: Moore's Law: Department of Defense Perspective. Center for Technology and National Security Policy/National Defense University, Washington: Defense Horizons 30/2003, 8 S.

Canadian Security Intelligence Service (Ed.): Weapons Proliferation and the Military-Industrial Complex of the PRC. Commentary 84/2003, 7 S.

Garrido, Marco: Small Arms Proliferation in the Philippines. The Joan B. Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies: Peace Colloquy 4/2003, S. 16 - 17.

McMillan, Joseph: Building an Iraqi Defense Force. Institute for National Strategic Studies/National Defense University: Washington, Strategic Forum No. 198/2003, 8 S.

Menashri, David: Iran after the Fall of Baghdad: Implications for Western Foreign and Security Policy. Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung: Bonn 2003, 10 S.

Michel, Leo G.: NATO Decisionmaking: Au Revoir to the Consensus Rule? Institute for National Strategic Studies/National Defense University: Washington, Strategic Forum No. 202/2003, 8 S.

Reeb, Hans-Joachim: Sicherheitspolitische Kultur in Deutschland seit 1990. Wissenschaftliches Forum für Internationale Sicherheit: Bremen 2003, 68 S.

Risse, Thomas: Beyond Iraq: The Crisis of the Transatlantic Security Community. In: Die Friedenswarte, Bd 78, 2-3/2003, S. 173 - 193.

Saikia, Jaideep: Terror sans Frontiers. Islamic Militancy in North East India. Program in Arms Control, Disarmament, and International Security/University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign: Occasional Paper July 2003, 86 S.

Schaper, Annette: Nukleare Rüstungskontrolle und Abrüstung. In: Wissenschaft und Frieden, 21. Jg. 4/2003, S. 16 - 18.

Theiler, Olaf: Die NATO im Umbruch. Bündnisreform im Spannungsfeld konkurrierender Nationalinteressen. Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft: Baden-Baden 2003, 357 S.

United Nations: The United Nations Disarmament Yearbook Volume 27:2002. Department for Disarmament Affairs: New York 2003, 493 S.

Wortmann, Rolf: Der Irakkrieg und die Zukunft der transatlantischen Beziehungen. Fachhochschule Osnabrück 2003, 45 S.

Global Threats Globalization

Beck, Ulrich: The Silence of Words: On Terror and War. In: Security Dialogue, Vol. 34, No. 3/2003, S. 255 - 267.

Makinda, Samuel M.: Global Governance and Terrorism. In: Global Change, Peace & Security, Vol. 15, No. 1/2003, S. 43 - 58.

Österreichisches Studienzentrum für Frieden und Konfliktlösung (Hg.): Jihad vs. McWorld. Friedenspolitik im Spannungsfeld zwischen Globalisierung und fundamentalistischer Bedrohung. Friedensbericht 2003. Agenda Verlag: Münster 2003, 288 S.

Pittenger, Richard F./Gagosian, Robert B.: Global Warming could have a Chilling Effect on the Military. Center for Technology and National Security Policy/National Defense University, Washington: Defense Horizons 33/2003, 8 S.

Senghaas-Knobloch, Eva: Globale Wirtschaftsstrukturen und „Global Governance“ im Politikfeld Arbeit - Auftrag und Möglichkeiten der Internationalen Arbeitsorganisation (IAO). Universität Bremen: artec-paper 106/2003, 24 S.

Weller, Christoph: Kein Frieden ohne Global Governance. In: Wissenschaft und Frieden, 21. Jg. 4/2003, S. 23 - 26.

Ethno-Nationalism Intra- and Inter-societal Conflicts

Aktionsgemeinschaft Dienst für den Frieden (Hg.): Christlich-islamische Friedensarbeit. „Die Aufgabe des Friedens und das Problem der Gewalt.“ - Eine christlich-islamische Begegnung -. Dokumentation eines Workshops vom 25. bis 27. Oktober 2002 in Hannover. Bonn 2002, 35 S.

Arbeitsgruppe Erdölprojekt-Tschad-Kamerun (Hg.): Das Tschad-Kamerun-Öl- und Pipeline-Projekt. Öl - Macht - Armut! Mühltal 2003, 36 S.

Matveeva, Anna with Duncan Hiscock, Wolf-Christian Paes and Hans Risser: Macedonia: Guns, policing and ethnic division. Saferworld and Bonn International Center for Conversion: London/Bonn 2003, 71 S.

Matveeva, Anna/Paes, Wolf-Christian: The Kosovo Serbs: An ethnic minority between collaboration and defiance. Bonn International Center for Conversion/Friedrich Naumann Foundation/Saferworld: Bonn/Belgrade/London 2003, 56 S.

Naidu, M. V.: Crises in Post-Saddam Iraq. In: Peace Research, Vol. 35, No. 1/2003, S. 1 - 15.

Pastreich, Emanuel: Sovereignty, Wealth, Culture, and Technology: Mainland China and Taiwan Grapple with the Parameters of „Nation State“ in the 21st Century. Program in Arms Control, Disarmament, and International Security/University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign: Occasional Paper July 2003, 14 S.

Rabasa, Angel M.: Political Islam in Southeast Asia: Moderates, Radicals and Terrorists. The International Institute for Strategic Studies: Adelphi Paper 358/2003, 82 S.

Shih, Cheng-Feng: Language and Ethnic Politics in Taiwan. In: International Journal of Peace Studies, Vol. 8, No. 2/2003, S. 89 - 102.

Valk, Aneke van der: Racism, a Threat to Global Peace. In: International Journal of Peace Studies, Vol. 8, No. 2/2003, S. 45 - 66.

Verwimp, Philip: Testing the Double-Genocide Thesis for Central and Southern Rwanda. In: The Journal of Conflict Resolution, Vol. 47, No. 4/2003, S. 423 - 442.

Peace Education Socio-psychological Peace Research

Albrecht, Ulrich/Becker, Jörg (Hg.): Medien zwischen Krieg und Frieden. Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft: Baden-Baden 2002, 287 S.

Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung (Hg.): Die Opfer der Diktaturen nicht vergessen. Erinnerungspolitische Arbeit der FES: Bonn 2003, 55 S.

Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung/Institut für Sozialgeschichte (Hg.): Archiv für Sozialgeschichte. 43. Band. Dietz Nachf.: Bonn 2003, 658 S.

Kümmel, Gerhard/Collmer, Sabine (Hg.): Soldat - Militär - Politik - Gesellschaft. Facetten militärbezogener sozialwissenschaftlicher Forschung. Liber amicorum für Paul Klein. Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft: Baden-Baden 2003, 261 S.

Porter, Elisabeth: Women, Political Decision-Making, and Peace-Building. In: Global Change, Peace & Security, Vol. 15, No. 3/2003, S. 245 - 262.

Rittberger, Volker (Hg.): Demokratie - Entwicklung - Frieden. Schwerpunkte Tübinger Politikwissenschaft. Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft: Baden-Baden 2003, 213 S.

Stiftung Die Schwelle (Hg.): Vom Mut, Schwellen zu überschreiten. 29 Beispiele internationaler Friedensarbeit. Bremen 2003, 78 S.

Pacifism & Non-violence Ethics of Peace

Diakonisches Werk der EKD „Brot für die Welt“/Institut für Friedenspädagogik: Basic needs. Eine faire Chance für alle. Stuttgart/Tübingen 2003, CD-Rom.

Evangelischer Pressedienst: Frieden in Gerechtigkeit. Christliche Friedensdienste. epd-Dokumentation 48/2003, 30 S.

Institut für Religion und Frieden beim Militärbischofsamt (Hg.): Ethica 2003. Jahrbuch des Instituts für Religion und Frieden. Wien 2003, 281 S.

Young, Seek Choue: Magna Carta of global common society. Grand vision of human society toward the new millennium. Institute of International Peace Studies: Seoul 1998, 37 S.

Meetings and Events 2004

1-2 April 2004

“International Conference to mark the 10th anniversary of the BICC”.

Contact: Bonn International Center for Conversion (BICC), An der Elisabethkirche 25, 53111 Bonn, Germany, Tel.: +49-228-91196-0, Fax: +49-228-241215, email: bicc@bicc.de, www.bicc.de

26 April-7 May 2004

“Peacebuilding & Conflict Resolution - Certificate Program”. Introduction to peace building and conflict resolution.

Contact: Canadian International Institute of Applied Negotiation (CIAN), 280 Albert Street, Suite 201, Ottawa, ON, Canada, K1P 5G8, Tel.: +1-613-237-9050, Fax: 1-613-237-6952, email: ciian@ciian.org, www.ciian.org

29-30 April 2004

“European Network for Peace and Human Rights”. Networking conference at the European Parliament in Brussels.

Contact: Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation, Russell House, Bulwell Lane, Nottingham NG6 0BT, Great Britain, Tel.: +44-115-9784-504, Fax: +44-115-9420-433, email: elfeuro@compuserve.com, www.russfound.org

4 May 2004

“Peace needs Women – Security Policy needs the Gender Perspective: on the implementation of UN Resolution 1325”. Forum in Berlin. Organised by the Feminist Institute of the Heinrich-Böll-Stiftung in collaboration with the Women’s Security Council and the Department of Foreign Affairs.

Contact: Heinrich-Böll-Stiftung (HBS), Hackesche Höfe, Rosenthaler Str. 40-41, 10178 Berlin, Germany, Tel.: +49-30-28534-202, Fax: +49-30-28534-119, email: alvarez@boell.de, www.boell.de

7-8 May 2004

“Nuclear Weapons and Energy in an Unstable World. Analyses and Solutions”. Congress of the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War (IPPNW).

Contact: IPPNW, Körtestr. 10, 10967 Berlin, Germany, Tel.: +49-30-698-074-0, Fax: +49-30-6938-166, email: ippnw@ippnw.de, www.ippnw.de

9-19 May 2004

“Sharing Tools for Personal/Global Harmony”. 12th Annual International Conference on Conflict Resolution in St Petersburg, Russia, sponsored by the Common Bond Institute (USA) and the Harmony Institute (Russia).

Contact: Common Bond Institute, Steve Olwean, Conference Coordinator, 12170 South Pine Ayr Drive, Climax, Michigan 49034, USA, Tel./Fax: +1-269-665-9393, email: solwean@aol.com, ahpweb.org/cbi/home.html

9 May 2004

“War and the Environment: Contexts and Consequences of Military Destruction in the Modern Age”. Conference at the German Historical Institute in Washington, DC, USA.

Contact: German Historical Institute, 1607 New Hampshire Ave., NW, Washington, DC, USA, Tel.: +1-202-387-33-55, Fax: +1-202-483-34-30, email: B.Thomas_AT_ghi-dc.org, www.ghi-dc.org

2-5 June 2004

"Interaction 2004". Conflict Resolution Network Canada's 8th Biennial Conference. This conference will take the form of more than 60 different workshops on basic theories and models of peace and conflict research and their relevance in practice.

Contact: Conflict Resolution Network Canada, Conrad Grebel University College, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, ON N2L 3G6, Canada, Tel.: +1-519-885-0880, Fax: +1-519-885-0806, email: crnetwork@crnetwork.ca, www.crnetwork.ca/conference/index.asp

4-6 June 2004

"The Strongest Man is Strongest when Alone - The USA as World Power". International conference at the Evangelische Akademie Loccum in collaboration with the Johns Hopkins University, Washington.

Contact: Evangelische Akademie Loccum, Münchehäger Straße 6, 31547 Rehburg-Loccum, Germany, Tel.: +49-5766-81-0 (switchboard), Fax: +49-5766-819-00, email: eal@evlka.de, www.loccum.de

8 June 2004

"Current Security Policy Issues". Forum at the Dresdener Studiengemeinschaft Sicherheitspolitik (DSS).

Contact: Dresdener Studiengemeinschaft Sicherheitspolitik, Prof. Dr. Dr. Ernst Woit, Liliengasse 15, 01067 Dresden, Germany, Tel.: +49-351-495-1857, Fax: +49-351-4951.857, email: ernst.woit@web.de, www.sicherheitspolitik-dss.de

10-12 June 2004

"Northern Ireland Conflict Resolution: An Introductory Programme". Introduction to the Northern Ireland Conflict by the International Conflict Research (INCORE), the United Nations University and the University of Ulster.

Contact: University of Ulster, Aberfoyle House, Northland Road, Derry/Londonderry, BT48 7JA, Northern Ireland, Tel.: 44-0-28-71-375500, Fax: 44-0-28-71-375510, email: school@incore.ulst.ac.uk, www.incire.ulst.ac.uk/news/events/ss/introNI.html

11-15 June 2004

"Teaching Nonproliferation Summer Institute" at the University of North Carolina at Asheville. This summer workshop focuses on environmental and health policy issues connected with the threat from weapons of mass destruction.

Contact: Ms. Dot Sulock, Department of Mathematics, CPO 2350 University of North Carolina at Asheville, NC 28804-8511, USA, Tel.: +1-828-232-5196 Fax: +1-828-251-6438, email: dsulock@unca.edu, www.unca.edu/nonproliferation

20 June 2004

"Group Conflicts and Prospects for Permanent Solutions". 2004 Annual Conference of the Forum für Peace Psychology.

Contact: Universität Marburg, Fachbereich Psychologie, Prof. Dr. Gert Sommer, Gutenbergstr. 18, 35037 Marburg, Germany, Tel.: +49-6421-34215, Fax: +49-6421-288-904, email: forum@friedenspsychologie.de, www.friedenspsychologie.de

23-27 June 2004

"Towards a World Without Violence". International congress at the Centre de Convencions International de Barcelona. Organised by the International Peace Bureau (IPB, Geneva) and the Fundacio per la Pau.

Contact: Fundacio per la Pau, Casp 31, 2n 1a, 08010 Barcelona, Spain, Tel.: +34-3-3025-129, Fax: +34-3-3017-562, email: info@fundacioperlapau.org, www.fundacioperlapau.org

25-26 June 2004

"United Nations Reform - UN Conference Potsdam 2004". Organised by the United Nations research council in collaboration with the Centre for Human Rights at the University of Potsdam.

Contact: Forschungskreis Vereinte Nationen, Dr. Helmut Volger, c/o Menschenrechtszentrum der Universität Potsdam, August-Bebel-Straße 89, 14482 Potsdam, Germany, Tel.: +49-331-977-3450, Fax: +49-331-977-3451, email: fkruno@rz.uni-potsdam.de, www.forschungskreis-vereinte-nationen.de

4-10 July 2004

"The Rebirth of Europe - On the Labour Pains of an Emancipated Europe and its relationship with the 'solitary superpower'". 21st international summer academy at the Friedenszentrum Burg Schlaining/Burgenland.

Contact: ÖSFK Außenstelle Wien, Thomas Roithner, Wiedner Gürtel 10, 1040 Wien, Austria, Tel.: +43-1-79-69-959, Fax: +43-1-79-65-711, email: aspr.vie@aspr.ac.at, www.aspr.ac.at/sak2004.htm

5-9 July 2004

"Peace and Conflict in a time of Globalization". 2004 conference of the International Peace Research Association (IPRA) in Sopron, Hungary.

Contact: Katsuya Kodama, Ph.D., Secretary General of IPRA, Department of Humanities, Mie University, 1515 Kamihama, Tsu, Japan, Tel. + Fax: +81-59-231-9156, email: kkodama@human.mie-u.ac.jp, www.human.mie-u.ac.jp/~peace/aboutipra.htm

7-10 July 2004

"Advanced course for educators and trainers on human rights education: acquiring the scientific foundations of the universality of human rights". International conference in Rome. Organised by the Centre for Human Evolution Studies Association (C.E.U.) and the Ius Primi Viri International (IPV).

Contact: C.E.U. Via Antonio Bertoloni 29, 00197 Roma, Italy, Tel.: +39-06-807-3420/808-5944, Fax: +39-06-807-7306, email: mailto:ceuroma@tin.it; ipvroma@tin.it, ceu@corsi.ws; ipvroma@tin.it, www.ceu.it; www.dirittumaniipv.org; www.ceu.corsi.ws

12-13 July 2004

"Can Faiths make Peace? Holy Wars and the Resolution of Religious Conflicts from Historical and Contemporary Perspectives". Conference of the Historical Institute at Goldsmiths College, University of London, which aims to study religious conflicts past and present.

Contact: Dr. P. Broadhead, Department of History, Goldsmiths College, University of London, New Cross, London SE14 6NW, Great Britain, Tel.: +44 -20-7919-7492, Fax +44-20-7919-7398, email: hsa01pb@gold.ac.uk, www.goldsmiths.ac.uk

25 July-1 August 2004

"'Compar' methods in dialogue". International conflict resolution academy. Organised by the Austrian Study Center for Peace and Conflict Resolution (Österreichisches Studienzentrum für Frieden und Konfliktlösung, ÖSFK).

Contact: ÖSFK, Hauptplatz 3, 7461 Stadtschlaining, Austria, Tel.: +43-3355-2498, Fax: +43-3355-2662, email: aspr@aspr.ac.at, www.aspr.ac.at

2-9 August 2004

"2004 World Conference against A&H Bombs" in Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

Contact: Japan Congress Against A- and H-Bombs/Gensuikin, Hitotsubashi Ki Bldg 5F, Tokyo 101-0051, Japan, Tel.: +49-81-3-3222-1091, Fax: +81-3-3222-1093, email: gensuikin@jca.apc.org, www.gensuikin.org/english/index.html

1-3 September 2004

"Multidisciplinary Findings in Conflict Research". Conference at the University of Ulster in collaboration with INCORE.

Contact: Prof. Jim Bryant, Sheffield Hallam University, Sheffield, S1 1WB, Great Britain, Tel.: +44-114-225-5155, email: J.W.Bryant@shu.ac.uk, www.conflictresearchsociety.org.uk/CRS%20Acts.htm

5-20 September 2004

"Fifth South Asian Orientation Course in Human Rights and Peace Studies" in Kathmandu, Nepal. International conference of the South Asia Forum for Human Rights (SAFHR).

Contact: South Asia Forum for Human Rights, GPO Box: 12855, Kathmandu, Nepal, Tel.: 977-1-5541026, Fax: 977-1-5527852, email: south@safhr.org, www.safhr.org

9-11 September 2004

"The 2004 Middle East & Central Asia Politics, Economics, and Society Conference: Transitions and Inequality in the 21st Century."

Contact: 2004 Middle East & Central Asia Conference Committee, c/o Political Science Department, 260 S. Central Campus Dr., OSH Building, Room 252, The University of Utah, Salt Lake City, UT 84112, USA, Tel.: +1-801-581-6047, Fax: +1-801-585-6492

2 November 2004

"EU Development Policy - the other Security Policy?". Conference within the framework of Bonner Impulse 2004. Organised by the Verband Entwicklungspolitik Deutscher Nichtregierungsorganisationen e.V. (VENRO), Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE), Center for International Cooperation Bonn (CIC) and European Association of Development Research and Training Institutes (EADI).

Contact: VENRO-Geschäftsstelle, Kaiserstraße 201, 53113 Bonn, Germany, Tel.: +49-228-94677-0, Fax: +49-228-94677-99, email: a.kurat@venro.org, www.venro.org