

Sektion 2: „Funktion und Performanz von Regionalorganisationen“;
Panel 9 (Freitag, 30.09.2016: 11:00 – 12:30): “Frieden und
Sicherheit durch Regionalorganisationen?” der 3-Länder-Tagung
der DVPW-ÖGPW-SVPW, 29.09.-01.10.2016 in Heidelberg

Panel Chairs:

Ingo Henneberg (Albert-Ludwigs Universität Freiburg)

Friedrich Plank (Johannes Gutenberg Universität Mainz)

Discussant:

Simon Koschut (Frei Universität Berlin)

Sicherheit durch Regionalorganisationen in den Amerikas und im post-sowjetischen Raum: Ein Vergleich von OAS, UNASUR, OSZE und SCO

Britta Weiffen, Universität São Paulo (brigitte.weiffen@uni-konstanz.de)

Vera Axyonova, Universität Gießen (vera.axyonova@sowi.uni-giessen.de)

Andrea Gawrich, Universität Gießen (andrea.gawrich@sowi.uni-giessen.de)

Das Paper untersucht die Agenda und die Institutionen im Sicherheitsbereich im postsowjetischen Raum und in den Amerikas. Zentrale Ziele dieses explorativen Papers sind der Vergleich intraregionaler Dynamiken und die Erklärung von unterschiedlichen Regionalismus-Tendenzen trotz substantieller Parallelen in beiden Regionen. So sind beide Regionen gekennzeichnet durch: a) die Konkurrenz einer traditionell einflussreichen Hegemonial- bzw. Supermacht des Kalten Krieges (Russland, USA) mit einer neu aufgestiegenen Führungsmacht (China, Brasilien), b) die Überlappung einer größeren alten mit einer kleineren neuen Regionalorganisationen, c) erhebliche Regime-Varianzen von demokratischen, hybriden und eher autokratischen Staaten.

Das Papier legt analytische Grundannahmen des Neoinstitutionalismus zugrunde sowie neuere Forschungen zum überlappenden Regionalismus und zu Macht, Führung und regionaler Ordnung in den internationalen Beziehungen. Angelegt als qualitative Vergleichsanalyse unternimmt es einen symmetrischen interregionalen Paar-Vergleich von Organisation für Sicherheit und Zusammenarbeit in Europa (OSZE), Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO) und Organisation Amerikanischer Staaten (OAS) und Union Südamerikanischer Nationen (UNASUR). Die Fallauswahl deckt für beide Regionen jeweils unterschiedliche Merkmale von Regionalorganisationen ab: umfassende vs. stark begrenzte Mitgliedschaft; Gründung im Kontext des Kalten Kriegs vs. jüngeres Gründungsdatum; von einer traditionellen Supermacht dominiert vs. von einer aufsteigenden Führungsmacht beeinflusst. Vorgesehen sind zwei Ebenen der Analyse. Zum einen bietet ein Set von Analysefragen Aufschluss über die jeweiligen intraregionalen Dynamiken: Wer setzt die Agenda im Sicherheitsbereich? Welchen Einfluss und welche Funktion haben die Regionalorganisationen? Folgen sie alten oder neuen Sicherheitskonzepten? Welche Rolle spielen potentielle interventionistische Befugnisse? Gibt es ein implizites oder offenes Konkurrenzverhältnis zwischen den beiden Organisationen in der jeweiligen Region? Sind sie eigenständiger Akteur, Instrument der einflussreichsten Staaten oder eine Arena, in der sich das Ringen um die Vorherrschaft in der Region abspielt? Die zweite Analyseebene arbeitet Unterschiede und Ähnlichkeiten zwischen den beiden Regionen heraus und sucht nach einem Erklärungsmuster für die analytischen Vergleichsbefunde.

Regional Security Cooperation in the SADC:
The Institutionalisation and Performance of the OPDS and the Standby Force
against the Background of Extra-Regional Influence

Johannes Muntschick

Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz

Abstract

The Southern African Development Community (SADC) is one of the most realistic and promising new regionalisms in the southern hemisphere. Besides engaging in regional economic and infrastructure integration, the SADC and its member states put a focus on regional security cooperation. In the year 1996, the organisation established the SADC Organ on Politics, Defence and Security (OPDS) as regional conflict management mechanism and proceeded to reform this institution in 2001. Several years later, in 2007, the SADC member states decided to adopt a Memorandum of Understanding on the establishment of a common SADC Standby Force. The latter was a great step towards deepening regional security integration despite the fact that there was virtually no structural demand in SADC countries to engage in such a costly endeavour. Altogether, it remains quite puzzling why and under what conditions SADC member states do follow a strategy of institutionalised regional security cooperation and whether these (conflict management) institutions become operative or effective at all. So far, scientific and theory-driven analyses on this research topic are lacking.

This paper addresses the puzzle outlined above and provides a theory-driven analysis to the following questions: Why do SADC countries engage in institutionalised regional security cooperation? Who or what influences the design of these institutions? What is the state of performance of these institutions?

Taking reference to cooperation- and regime theory, the paper develops a situation-structural approach to the analysis and explanation of regionalism that takes the factor 'external influence' – i.e. the horizontal level – explicitly into account. The paper argues that it was South Africa as regional hegemon who most significantly influenced the institutional design and tasks of the OPDS. With regard to the SADC Standby Force, however, it was extra-regional actors – notably the EU as a decisive donor – that provided external incentives for SADC members to start the process of institutionalising the regional brigade.

Evaluating the performance of both of these projects, there is empirical evidence that the OPDS has contributed – after a lengthy period of institutional paralysis – to regional confidence-building measures as well as to conflict resolution with regard to conflicts in Lesotho, the DR Congo and particularly Madagascar. The SADC Standby Force is yet a ‘shadow-army’ due to its yet unproven operational readiness and the temporary closure of its training centre. The paper concludes that externally fuelled regionalism can be only successful and functional as long as sufficient external means are provided that compensate for the regional actors’ costs of institutionalisation.

Global Trends and Regional Variations: UN and Regional Peacekeeping in Comparative Perspective

Paper Proposal submitted for the Drei-Länder-Tagung of the DVPW, SVPW, ÖVPW

Anja Jetschke, University of Goettingen, Germany

Bernd Schlipphak, University of Muenster, Germany

Email: anja.jetschke@sowi.uni-goettingen.de, bernd.schlipphak@uni-muenster.de

Over the last decade, regional organizations have developed a sophisticated set of instruments for peacekeeping. This raises important questions: Do regional organizations only take over a larger share of military interventions, or do they also challenge the very regulation of peace enforcement and peacekeeping as defined in the UN Charter of 1945? Based on a dataset of all interventions by the UN, regional organizations and individual states, the paper advances three arguments: First, since the 1990s, regional organizations have indeed taken over a much larger share of military interventions. They have regionalized interventions that were earlier under the prerogative of the UN or individual states. Second, this trend shows some interesting regional variation. Some regions, like Southeast Asia and Latin America, remain free of military interventions by regional organizations, whereas others, such as Eurasia, remain free of UN interventions. Finally, the paper argues that for the time being, the regionalization of military interventions does not indicate a challenge of the collective security system established after World War II.

Scope and Effectiveness of Interregional Relations as Security Providers – The Case of EU-AU Cooperation in the Central African Republic

Friedrich Plank, MA

Johannes Gutenberg Universität Mainz

friedrich.plank@politik.uni-mainz.de

Regional Organizations (ROs) do not only contribute to security within their territories but also extend stability to their neighbourhoods. The most prominent example is the European Union (EU), which has strengthened its profile in foreign policy significantly during the last decades. One important feature of Europe's international ambitions is the spread of interregional relations between the EU and counterparts which increasingly focus on security issues. However, since interregional security cooperation has barely been analyzed systematically additional research is necessary in particular with regard to the performance of interregionalism. Assessing the cooperation between the EU and the African Union (AU) in the African Peace Facility and its engagement in the Central African Republic (CAR) between 2012 and 2013 this paper examines in how far we can measure effectiveness in the context of interregional relations and to what extent EU-AU interregional security cooperation is effective. My conceptualization of effectiveness draws on international relations-theory and research on EU foreign policy, and includes both internal (goal attainment) and external perspectives (problem-solving). The findings suggest that interregional cooperation of the AU and the EU in the CAR managed to be effective at least in the long term. With regard to evaluative criteria, slow troop deployment and a focus on the capital area decreased the impact of the crisis management. However, the cooperation contributed to a decrease of the violence and thus attained its main internal and external goals.