



Perspektiven auf globale Politik

AFK-EUPRA – 17 (PART 1) AND 19 (PART 2): (IN-)SECURITY, (DE-)MILITARIZATION, POST- LIBERAL DEVELOPMENTS

12. März 2017 · von jungeafk · in AFK-EUPRA 2017 · [Hinterlasse einen Kommentar](#)

**AFK-EuPRA – 17 (Part 1):
(In-)Security, (De-)Militarization, Post-Liberal Developments: Challenges**

Chair: Hendrik Bullens (fm Augsburg University COPE, Germany;
Eurasian National University Astana, Kazakhstan; EuPRA Board)

Presenters:

Rudra Prasad Pradhan (BITS Pilani KK Birla Goa Campus, India): Silent Wars & Violent Wars: Perspective on Global Peace Investment

Havva Kök Arslan (Hacettepe University, Turkey): An Assessment of Prescriptive and Elicitive Approaches to July 15 Coup Attempt in Turkey

Roisin Smith (Maynooth University, Ireland): To Act or not to Act in our Age of Insecurity

Papers:

Pablo Aguiar Molina (International Catalan Institute for Peace, Spain): Do (No) Armies Make the Difference?



Folgt uns per E-Mail:

Schließe dich 1.214 Followern an

Gib deine E-Mail-Adresse ein

E-Mail Adresse eintragen

SUCHE

Search this site...

LETZTE KOMMENTARE

- Kommentar zu Ein „westafrikanisches Afghanistan“? Staatskrise in Mali und Herausforderungen an eine ECOWAS-Intervention von Ein “westafrikanisches Afghanistan”? Zur Staatskrise in Mali und der bevorstehenden

When making Foreign Policy Analysis many elements are taken into account. Surprisingly having (or not having) an army is not been viewed as a relevant factor when making this analysis. Approximately one out of eight countries in the world do not have an army, it is a sample big enough as to allow the search of some common pattern of international behaviour. This paper aims to examine the role countries without armies play in International Relations. The first part of the paper will be focused on clarifying which are the countries not having armies. Once clarified an two fold analysis will be devoted. An initial question of this part would be: do countries without armies behave differently than the rest of countries? Limited size and population are two characteristics common to all these nonmilitarised countries, but can we reveal some kind of similar behaviour in the international scene?.

On a second part another element will be examined: is their influence superior to their expected capacities? In other words, is being nonmilitarised a useful element, specially when treating issues related with peace, armed conflict and/or war? This second part will examine specially the roles played by Costa Rica and Iceland on international organizations, most specially in UN. I will try to reveal if not having an army is, at the end of the day, and on a mere instrumental (not just ethical) basis, a good idea.

Shenin Andrei (L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Kazakhstan): The Trump Administration and Nuclear Weapons: What's next?

When Donald Trump arrived to power, many experts were concerned regarding his ideas on U.S. nuclear weapons. Particular attention was paid to his tweet about strengthening the U.S. nuclear arsenal after 25 years of the consistent WMD-disarmament under "The Cooperative Threat Reduction Program" (aka "Nunn-Lugar Program" an array of START treaties). In that period, U.S. and Russia removed more than 8,000 warheads and elements of the nuclear triad – submarines, ICBMs and long-range bombers. Now, experts worry that Trump's aspirations will bury the U.S.-Russian nuclear cooperation aimed at global security.

However, a rather neglected part of today's debate is that it is happening under the largest modernization of the U.S. armed forces of all times. Based on various calculations, modernization requires from \$600 billion to \$1 trillion for the next 30 years – an incredible burden. Moreover, since 2011 the U.S. budget is regulated by Budget Control Act 2011 that sets limits for every budget item overspending. Hence, officials have to focus all the more on prioritizing– the nuclear triad, conventional weapons or R&D.

Intervention - Genocide
Alert 3. September 2016

- Kommentar zu Über uns / About von Roberta Ioana 4. Mai 2016

TWITTER

- RT @gphofmann: Peace and Conflict Studies from the Margins to the Centre - Discussions & complementary #AFK-#EuPRA-conference info availabl... | 1 hour ago
- Blog for the AFK-EuPRA-conference 2017
ibkommentar.wordpress.de/2017/03/12/blo...
<https://t.co/scHhOqpIEy> | 21 hours ago

BLOGROLL

- A View From the Cave
- Aidnography
- ArmsControlWonk
- Chris Blattman
- Göttinger Institut für Demokratieforschung
- Inner City Press
- International Law Observer
- IR Blog (Berlin)
- ISN Blog ETH Zürich
- Jihadica
- Junge UN Forschung
- Junge Wissenschaft im öffentlichen Recht
- Justice in Conflict
- Kings of War

The discussion on strengthening the nuclear triad is regularly fueled by what some call hysteria around the Russian army modernization, North Korean missile launches and Iranian nuclear programs. Trump Administration criticizes U.S-Iranian deal and thinks about allowing U.S. Asian allies – Japan, Saudi Arabia and South Korea – to develop their own nuclear program to defend themselves from potential North Korean aggression. Such ways of nuclear proliferation would be the opposite of NPT efforts and accordingly very dangerous.

As for the U.S., it is worth to mention that officials very rarely develop strategic concepts themselves, preferring ordered expertise from “Think Tanks”. All the American Think Tanks, as well as the U.S. political establishment, are divided into several interest groups in accordance with their political views. For example, “Brookings Institution” is usually considered liberal-democratic, while “American Enterprise Institute” backs neo-conservative groups. Consequently, their discussions will have a significant impact on the decision-making process in the White House and the Congress.

For now, we can see a polarization of views. For example, the conservative “Heritage Foundation” regards Russia’s military modernization as a main threat and a reason for U.S. nuclear triad upgrading, while “Brookings Institution” considers the former merely as replacement of outdated weaponry, and the U.S. should continue with nuclear disarmament as a global security policy.

This paper aims to analyze and clarify views of different interest groups in both the political establishment and expert community on the future of U.S. nuclear weapons – and other – programs – in order to better understand/predict possible/likely directions of the U.S. nuclear policy and its impact on global security.

Punit Gaur (Pakistan/Kazakhstan): The Silkroad Project: China’s ,West-Expansion’?

AFK-EuPRA – 19 (Part 2):

(In)Security, (De-)Militarization, Post-Liberal Developments: To dos

Chair: Itır Toksöz (Doğuş University, Turkey)

Presenters:

Indrajit Sharma (Central University of Gujarat, India) & Shalu Runthala (BITS Pilani KK Birla Goa Campus, India): State vs. Human Security Debate on the Migrant Crisis in Europe

- menschenhandel heute
- Mobilizing Ideas
- Opinio Juris
- Political Violence @ a Glance
- Pundicity – Aymen Jawad Al-Tamimi
- Radikale Ansichten
- Sicherheitspolitik-Blog
- Stephen M. Walt
- Syria Comment
- The Disorder of Things
- The Duck of Minerva
- The Monkey Cage
- Theorieblog
- Theorieleben
- Theory Talks
- Thought Economics
- Völkerrechtsblog
- World Peace Foundation – Reinventing Peace
- zoon politikon

META

- Registrieren
- Anmelden
- Beitrags-Feed (RSS)
- Kommentare als [RSS](#)
- WordPress.com

Conflict and insecurity have largely been the major driving factors behind the current wave of population influx in *Europe*. It is desirable that to understand the current migrant crisis in Europe, it is essential to understand the nature of the on-going conflict and existing insecurities in the home states from where the migrants are coming. Countries like Afghanistan, Iraq and Syria comprise the largest group of migrants in Europe. These countries are at the lowest rank on the 2015 Global Peace Index. This depicts the challenges and humanitarian crises that the people residing at the areas of civil conflict are facing. The contemporary post-cold war era has shown that the kind of violence and conflict has largely been intra-state and protracted in nature. Given the fact that the chances for a conventional war has been limited due to the presence of nuclear capabilities of some nations, most of the conflicts are confined to intra-state conflicts (also called as the low intensity conflicts) which sometimes are seen in the form the state sponsored terrorism. While such conflicts may have geo-political reasons and vested interests of some groups inciting modern day conflicts, it has given rise to attention towards a more focused and human oriented approach for conflict resolution and transformation in the form of aid and post-conflict reconstruction and various peace building mechanisms.

Today, the threat perceptions for international community have largely been seen from the non-traditional discourse which securitizes migration and population influx as one of the major challenges in the contemporary world. The world community has recognized the issue of migration as a security challenge from the human security perspective as well as from the state security. While migration forms real threats to national as well as human security, it is both that are at stake for the world community. The concept of national security entails the idea of securing the lives of individuals and protecting their human rights. However, the recent migrant crisis in EU has raised the question of state security in terms of sovereignty versus the human security. Also, while people have been affected as many of them died and occasionally have been victimized in the criminal activities, the states have given more attention towards the border control. Further, it is apprehensive that inadequate policy measures can result in fuelling humanitarian crises.

Under such backdrop, the present paper looks into the debate of state vs. human security while dealing with the questions such as: What is the response of the international community on the dichotomy between the state and human security? What are the steps in terms of political and humanitarian policy measures that Europe has come up with in regard to the issue of migrant crisis? How effective will it be to investing in the war and poverty torn countries for creating jobs and building its economy in a situation where there is an on-going conflict which has taken a protracted form?

Klaus Schlichtmann (Nihon University, Japan): Rethinking Europe in an Unequal World – The Case for a Just and Strengthened United Nations

Die Wahlen über den Verbleib Großbritanniens in der EU haben die europäische Ordnung erschüttert. Der Vortrag/Die Präsentation soll nicht nur die Hintergründe beleuchten, sondern auch zeigen, welche Chancen die neue Situation eröffnet, Chancen, die es vorher so nicht gegeben hat. Allerdings läuft die EU Gefahr, sollten diese Chancen nicht ergriffen werden, dass das Projekt Europa scheitert. Die historischen Versäumnisse nach 1945 und die Tatsache, dass die Europäische Union nach dem Ende des Kalten Krieges nichts unternommen hat, die Vereinten Nationen zu stärken und militärische Friedenssicherungskompetenzen und Einrichtungen zugunsten der Weltorganisation der Vereinten Nationen und einer rechtsverbindlichen Weltfriedensordnung abzubauen, geben Anlass zu Besorgnis. Vor allem die Bundesrepublik hat mit ihrer prompten Wiederbewaffnung nach dem Krieg und zuletzt ihrem aktiven Engagement für eine EU-Armee Zeichen gesetzt, die Zweifel an ihren Absichten aufkommen lassen. Das Militär, die „verdinglichte Unvernunft der Staaten“ (Ekkehart Krippendorff), ist letztendlich, wie die Geschichte der letzten fünfhundert und speziell der letzten hundert Jahre gezeigt hat, nicht in der Lage Frieden und Sicherheit der Bürger auf Dauer zu gewährleisten. Für die neue globale Sicherheitsstruktur, für welche der Beitrag werben möchte, ist auch die Einbeziehung des Globalen Südens eine notwendige Voraussetzung.

Unto Vesa (University of Tampere, Finland): Security, Arms Control, Disarmament and Confidence Building Measures in the Baltic Sea Region

Taking into consideration the stalemate of all disarmament negotiations as well as the worsening situation in the Baltic Sea region, I would like to present another paper as well, discussing the security trends in the Baltic Sea region and the potential of confidence building measures in this region as well as to discuss in this context the prospects of arms control and disarmament in general as well as specifically in Europe particularly in the Baltic Sea region. There are negative trends even regarding nuclear weapons and the prospects in the immediate future regarding any progress are limited, but even the small positive margins have to be explored.



Bewerten:

Rate This

Teilen mit:



Sei der Erste dem dies gefällt.

Ähnliche Beiträge

AFK-EuPRA – 11 (Part 1) and 14 (Part 2): From Hot War to Negative, Positive or Hybrid Peace? Inclusive Peacemaking and Comprehensive Post-Conflict Tasking

AFK-EuPRA – 3 (Part 1), 6 (Part 2) and 7 (Part 3): Forced Migration and Inequality: The Production and Process of (Forced) Migration
In "AFK-EUPRA 2017"

AFK-EuPRA – 16: Peace Studies and (De-)Coloniality
In "AFK-EUPRA 2017"

Kommentar verfassen

Gib hier Deinen Kommentar ein ...

← [AFK-EuPRA – 18 \(Part 1\) and 23 \(Part 2\):
Conflict and Peace in Arts, Media and
the Public](#)

[AFK-EuPRA – 16: Peace Studies and
\(De-\)Coloniality](#) →

Erstelle eine kostenlose Website oder Blog – auf WordPress.com.