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At the PIN Roadshow in Koblenz, the members of the Steering Committee shared their insights and research findings with a group of students from various universities and research institutes. The overall topic of the Roadshow was ‘Negotiation on Prevention and Reconciliation as Risk Management’. The Peace Academy Rhineland-Palatinate and the Rwanda-Centre at the University of Koblenz-Landau jointly hosted the two-day conference. Prof. Dr. Felix Hampe, Vice President of the University of Koblenz-Landau, Dr. Sascha Werthes, Director of the Peace Academy Rhineland-Palatinate, and Siegmar Seidel, Director of the Rwanda-Centre at the University of Koblenz-Landau, delivered short welcoming speeches.

The conference was opened by Prof. Dr. William Zartman, Johns Hopkins University, Washington. His introduction emphasized the process-oriented approach to international negotiations of the PIN-Group. Prof. Zartman presented the most recent publication by PIN which tackles the Arab Spring from a negotiation perspective. He further announced the forthcoming publication edited by PIN members on the topic of reconciliation as negotiation. Following the welcome by Prof. Zartman, the PIN Steering Committee members presented the state of the art of their research.

Dr. Paul Meerts, the Netherlands Institute of International Relations, Clingendael, gave an overview of the evolution of international diplomatic negotiation processes. Using the negotiations on the Westphalian Peace Agreement in 1648 as a starting point, he pointed out that a combination of internal and external factors is necessary to kick-start international negotiation processes. Peace, justice, and a common project for the future increase the sustainability of negotiations. In addition, effective mechanisms of inter-country control, as currently implemented within the EU, can compensate for the generally low level of trust among states. After all, negotiations are war by peaceful means.
In his presentation, Dr. Mikhail Troitskiy, Moscow State Institute of International Relations, summarized the current state of play of the negotiations on cybersecurity. There are currently no effective regulations in place. Reaching an agreement on basic rules of conduct, the scope of regulations or restrictions, and the issue of compliance, is a difficult task. The current debate encompasses concurring approaches to regulate cyberspace; reaching from demands for maintaining a space of freedom to applying sovereignty principles to cyberspace. Remaining challenges comprise perceived differences in the cyber-potential of actors, the lack of transparency of cyberspace activities, the role of governments and legitimate targets of cyberattacks – to name but a few.

Dr. Mordechai Melamud, Provisional Technical Secretariat of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty Organization, provided insights on the negotiations on a WMD-free zone (WMDFZ) in the Middle East. The Middle East is one of the most conflict-prone regions world-wide; hence, an agreement on a WMDFZ is a highly ambitious endeavor. The current political situation in the region is marked by the Arab Spring, the refugee crisis, the contentious agreement with Iran (JCPOA), the rule of extreme groups, the breaking of the Sykes-Picot Agreement, and terrorism. These security challenges in combination with a high level of mistrust between states make confidence-building measures an essential prerequisite for further negotiations on a WMDFZ in the Middle East.

In the following presentation, Dr. Valérie Rosoux, Université Catholique de Louvain, tackled the question of how to deal with the past in countries that lived through mass atrocities? She focused on the concepts of ‘memory’ and ‘reconciliation’ in post-conflict contexts. Dr. Rosoux shared insights on the traditional Gacaca Courts that were established in the aftermath of the genocide and were criticized by the Rwandan society. Contentious issues concerned the proceedings of the courts, their partiality, and the frustration of those who were not entitled to tell their story before the courts. In her conclusion, Dr. Rosoux emphasized the necessity to manage internal and external expectations with respect to the Gacaca courts in particular and reconciliation in general.
Prof. Dr. Mark Anstey, Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University Port Elizabeth, shared his insights on (re)conciliation from a South African perspective. He asked the question whether the 1994 benchmarks for reconciliation are still valid today. South Africa is a deeply class-divided society and, despite huge progress made, the country remains unreconciled. In fact, reconciliation across race lines has so far only been successful among the country’s middle and upper class. The majority of the population, however, lives on 2$ per day. Hence, the best framework for harmonious living in South Africa are inclusive political institutions and economic development. Reconciliation needs to be based on bench marks that take the country’s current situation as a starting point.

Prof. Dr. William Zartman, Johns Hopkins University Washington, started his presentation on preventive diplomacy by pointing out two fundamental dilemmas of prevention: first, it is impossible to prove prevention; second, conflict is a natural, omnipresent, and at times beneficial phenomenon that cannot be prevented. Despite these dilemmas, a number of conflicts have been successfully prevented in the past and it is important to learn from these cases.

The second part of Prof. Zartman’s talk focused on matching conflict levels with appropriate prevention measures. While the establishment of international norms and regimes can serve as instruments for long-term prevention; early warning mechanisms and awareness-raising are appropriate for preventing conflicts in the mid-term. Short-term, pre-crisis prevention encompasses three measures, namely conflict interruption, e.g. through cease-fires, separating conflict parties, and integration. Finally, the implementation of agreements, mechanisms for dispute-settlements and common projects are at the core of post-conflict preventive measures. Prof. Zartman stressed the importance of categorizing and organizing our previous knowledge on conflict prevention in order to identify knowledge gaps, e.g. on new agents and types of conflicts.

Following the presentations by the PIN Steering Committee members, the Roadshow participants had the opportunity to clarify further questions and enter into discussions with the PIN members during three thematic panels: ‘Contemporary Challenges in Preventive Diplomacy’ offered by Prof. Zartman; ‘Reconciliation – Rwanda,
South Africa and Beyond’ by Dr. Rosoux and Prof. Anstey; and ‘Risk Management – WMDs and Cybersecurity’ by Dr. Troitskiy and Dr. Melamud.
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