

EISS 2024 - Annual Conference



INSTITUTE
OF POLITICAL STUDIES
Faculty of Social Sciences
Charles University

Report of Contributions

Contribution ID: 139

Type: **Paper Abstract (Closed Panels)**

The strategic adoption of Artificial Intelligence by ransomware groups

I examine how ransomware groups –groups of hackers who encrypt stolen data and financially coerce victims to pay to recover the data –adopt Artificial Intelligence (AI) in their operations. I show that many ransomware groups stand to gain a number of operational advantages from AI, including identification of target vulnerabilities, prediction of victim response, and assistance to negotiation and fund extraction. However, most groups have not exploited AI programs because they contain major challenges, including risks of detection and uncertainty of product quality. The article demonstrates that adoption of emerging autonomous technology is a risky business for hacking entities, which is why there is only a small number of instances in which hackers have used AI to extort digital victims for payment. This suggests that ransomware groups rational actors who closely study merits and demerits of AI and that they use reason and risk analysis to make decisions on the selection of technologies they deploy.

What discipline or branch of humanities or social sciences do you identify yourself with?

political science, IR, cybersecurity

If you are submitting an Open Panel proposal, have you included all four abstracts in attachment?

No, I am submitting a Closed Panel abstract

Are you a PhD student or early-career researcher?

No

Primary author: KATAGIRI, Nori (Saint Louis University)

Presenter: KATAGIRI, Nori (Saint Louis University)

Contribution ID: 140

Type: **Poster Proposal**

Will ships finally be safe in the Black Sea? Changes in the security and defense policies of the NATO riparian states of the Black Sea since the start of the war in Ukraine

With the formalization of Sweden's accession to the alliance, the Baltic Sea will officially become a NATO lake - a success story that proves transatlantic unity and political determination to generate a credible defense and deterrence posture on the eastern flank. The same cannot be said for the other half of the flank, which is exposed to a range of security challenges.

This preliminary research poster aims to highlight the main trends and changes in the security and defense policies of the NATO riparian states of the Black Sea since 24th of February 2022, in a comparative manner. Notably, we will look into the patterns of change regarding defense investment policies, military spending and innovation, as well as the development of the maritime capabilities and the endeavors of the regional cooperation initiatives.

Starting from the premise that the war in Ukraine was a trigger for the governments of Romania, Bulgaria and Turkey to develop their Black Sea deterrence and defense components, using methods such as public policy content analysis and literature review, we will look at the direction these governments have taken since that turning point in defense policy and whether the prerequisites for shaping a regional identity for security cooperation exist.

Blockquote

What discipline or branch of humanities or social sciences do you identify yourself with?

International Security - Master Student

If you are submitting an Open Panel proposal, have you included all four abstracts in attachment?

Yes, I have included all required information (see below).

Are you a PhD student or early-career researcher?

No

Primary author: PUP, Antonia-Laura (Paris School of International Affairs, Sciences Po)

Presenter: PUP, Antonia-Laura (Paris School of International Affairs, Sciences Po)

Track Classification: Poster Session

Contribution ID: 144

Type: **Paper Abstract (Closed Panels)**

Proliferation not democratization: open-source intelligence and the war in Ukraine

Russia's war in Ukraine has brought unprecedented attention to open-source intelligence (OSINT) researchers who collect and analyse publicly available information on conflict zones and security threats. Some observers believe easy access to online information has "democratised" intelligence. The investigative group Bellingcat even claims to be an "intelligence agency for the people". While the digital revolution has turned many smartphone-equipped individuals into sensors, it did not turn everyone into a professional intelligence collector and analyst. The ubiquity of digital tools enables small groups of skilled and well-resourced individuals to leverage open-source data and information (OSINF) and produce outputs that are comparable to finished government intelligence. Barriers to entry in the field of professional intelligence remain high. The rise of OSINT is not about democratization but proliferation of intelligence capabilities.

What discipline or branch of humanities or social sciences do you identify yourself with?

Security Studies (Van Puyvelde) and War Studies (Ford)

If you are submitting an Open Panel proposal, have you included all four abstracts in attachment?

No, I am submitting a Closed Panel abstract

Are you a PhD student or early-career researcher?

No

Primary author: VAN PUYVELDE, Damien (Leiden University)

Co-author: Dr FORD, Matthew (Swedish Defence University)

Presenter: VAN PUYVELDE, Damien (Leiden University)

Session Classification: Intelligence

Track Classification: Closed Panels: Intelligence

Contribution ID: 149

Type: **Paper Abstract (Closed Panels)**

Toward a Novel Conception of Naval Strategy for Small Countries

Thursday, 27 June 2024 12:00 (20 minutes)

With the advent of the New Revolution in Military Affairs, the strategic environment that existed during the post-Cold War “unipolar moment,” when the US and its junior alliance partners could conduct combined arms operations with guaranteed air superiority and freedom of maneuver in the seas, is no more. Nevertheless, the fact that the globalized, hyperconnected 21st century will be a century where great power competition will in large part be over command of the sea is at odds with the scant literature to inform in particular small states’ naval strategy in the new bi/multipolar strategic environment. While there have been some recent works reviewing the literature, for example by Mulqueen et al. and McCabe et al., the latter rightly admit that these works have “only touched the surface of the topic”; indeed, it is more descriptive than theorizing. Long lulled into a false sense of security, and unwavering American protection, Europe’s current posture and approach are wholly inadequate. Especially if multiple crises in different parts around Europe crop up simultaneously, smaller European states dependent on the UK and France—Europe’s only two serious naval powers—will soon be overwhelmed. At the same time, it is smaller European countries’ combined economic surplus that can potentially yield the added capabilities that move us to European “strategic autonomy.” That is, if a region-centered common naval strategy is devised, a communication and command infrastructure separate from NATO is set up, needs-based procurement toward 2035 happens in a coordinated, complementary fashion, and there is the political will and long-term financial commitment along the lines of the “Zeitenwende” to do so. This article explores what a credible European external posture could look like, and how small European navies could contribute to such an overall stronger defense outlook.

What discipline or branch of humanities or social sciences do you identify yourself with?

Political Science; International Relations; International Security Studies

If you are submitting an Open Panel proposal, have you included all four abstracts in attachment?

No, I am submitting a Closed Panel abstract

Are you a PhD student or early-career researcher?

Yes

Primary author: Dr STEVENS, Friso (University of Helsinki)

Presenter: Dr STEVENS, Friso (University of Helsinki)

Session Classification: Defence Cooperation and Military Assistance

Track Classification: Closed Panels: Defence Cooperation and Military Assistance

Contribution ID: 150

Type: **Paper Abstract (Closed Panels)**

Taking Advantage of Government Repression: How Terrorist Groups Adapt Domestic Terrorism Target Selection To Recruit

Models of terrorism target selection are not well connected to strategic decision-making and behavioural motivations. This paper addresses this gap and connects terrorist groups' strategic objectives of recruitment and support building with terrorist attack decision-making. Terrorist groups make strategic short-term changes in two violent tactics –(1) attack target selection and (2) attack brutality –following government repression to attract support from aggrieved and vengeful individuals. A new model of Government-Civilians-Terrorist Group interactions is introduced that develops expectations of how terrorist groups react to government repression of civilians. Terrorist groups can appeal to civilians' desires for vengeance by strategically attacking government actors responsible for repression and increasing the brutality of these attacks. Terrorist groups can also restrict violence against civilians to keep grievances focused on government repression. Identifying these strategic adaptations in terrorist attack patterns improves two of the largest limitations in terrorism studies –understanding terrorist groups' strategic calculus and attack target selection. The proposed terrorist group strategic adaptations are assessed using Event Coincidence Analysis (ECA), a big data analytics methodology applied in brain and climate sciences, but is lacking in terrorism studies. ECA identifies causation and temporal patterns between events. In the analysis, repression is measured by government response to protest events and tested against domestic terrorist attack event data from 1990-2017. The initial results show that physical abuse of protesters and killing protesters trigger 79% and 101% increased risk of attacks against government targets, respectively. Whereas, neither triggers an increased risk of terrorism against civilian targets.

What discipline or branch of humanities or social sciences do you identify yourself with?

Political Science

If you are submitting an Open Panel proposal, have you included all four abstracts in attachment?

No, I am submitting a Closed Panel abstract

Are you a PhD student or early-career researcher?

No

Primary author: KLEIN, Graig (Leiden University)

Presenter: KLEIN, Graig (Leiden University)

Track Classification: Closed Panels: Terrorism and Counter-Terrorism

Contribution ID: 154

Type: **Paper Abstract (Closed Panels)**

Contesting 'Zeitenwende': Political Contestation and Partisan Entrapment

The rise of political polarization and partisan contestation over foreign and security policy has challenged traditional notions of bipartisanship and cross-party consensus in democratic countries. While partisan contestation seems to be prevalent, there are instances where cross-party consensus emerges. This paper theorizes a novel causal mechanism of partisan entrapment through which cross-party consensus can emerge in parliamentary democracies. The paper tests this novel mechanism by examining the partisan contestation over Germany's military aid to Ukraine in the wake of the 2022 Russian invasion. This paper contributes to the growing literature on the party-political contestation of foreign and security policy and the scholarship on foreign policy consensus.

What discipline or branch of humanities or social sciences do you identify yourself with?

International Relations

If you are submitting an Open Panel proposal, have you included all four abstracts in attachment?

No, I am submitting a Closed Panel abstract

Are you a PhD student or early-career researcher?

Yes

Primary author: GHINCEA, Marius (European University Institute)

Presenter: GHINCEA, Marius (European University Institute)

Session Classification: Military Interventions

Track Classification: Closed Panels: Military Interventions

Contribution ID: 156

Type: **Paper Abstract (Closed Panels)**

Defence Offsets and the Global Arms Trade: Explaining Cross-National Variations

This book offers the first comprehensive study of defence offsets and its economic, security, political and theoretical implications.

Originating in the second half of the 19th century, defence offsets –additional economic, industrial and technological benefits to states for buying foreign weapons –have since been a key feature of the global arms trade and defence industry. And yet, offsets are an underresearched and undertheorised phenomenon. This book fills this gap in the literature by offering the first general theory of defence offsets, as well as the first systematic analysis of the offset phenomenon. By building on the insights of scholars of defence economics and drawing from the International Relations liberal paradigm, as well as reviving and adapting Robert Putnam’s two-level game framework, the book proposes a liberal-rationalist theory of defence offsets. It then proves the worth of such a theory through Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA) of fifty-four fighter aircraft transfers from 1992 to 2021 inclusive, and three in depth case studies addressing offsets negotiated and agreed to as part of fighter aircraft competitions in Brazil, India and South Korea. This book will be of interest to students of defence studies, defence economics, security studies and International Relations.

What discipline or branch of humanities or social sciences do you identify yourself with?

International Relations and security studies

If you are submitting an Open Panel proposal, have you included all four abstracts in attachment?

No, I am submitting a Closed Panel abstract

Are you a PhD student or early-career researcher?

Yes

Primary author: ANICETTI, Jonata

Presenter: ANICETTI, Jonata

Contribution ID: 169

Type: **Paper Abstract (Closed Panels)**

Public support for arms control in the third nuclear age: New evidence from NATO countries

During the Cold War, Western public opinion was an important factor in shaping the trajectory of nuclear arms control talks between the United States and the Soviet Union. However, we know little about the extent of public support for arms control in today's era of renewed great power competition. To address this gap, we conducted a series of surveys and survey experiments in the United States, United Kingdom, France, Germany, and Poland. Our results show a high rate of approval of new arms control talks between the United States and its strategic competitors, Russia and China, among the citizens of all five NATO countries. Using data from a new elite survey of UK parliamentarians, we also found a sizeable gap between the views of the UK public and their political representatives. Finally, we demonstrate that public views can be strongly shaped by elite cues from experts and politicians, with arguments about the risk of non-compliance significantly reducing the support for new arms control negotiations. Our findings contribute to the scholarly literature on public attitudes toward nuclear weapons as well as to the policy debates on the feasibility and desirability of strategic arms control in the "third nuclear age."

What discipline or branch of humanities or social sciences do you identify yourself with?

Security Studies

If you are submitting an Open Panel proposal, have you included all four abstracts in attachment?

No, I am submitting a Closed Panel abstract

Are you a PhD student or early-career researcher?

Yes

Primary author: SMETANA, Michal (Charles University)**Co-authors:** VRANKA, Marek (Charles University); ROSENDORF, Ondřej (IFSH & PRCP)**Presenter:** SMETANA, Michal (Charles University)**Session Classification:** Weapons of Mass Destruction Non-Proliferation and Arms Control**Track Classification:** Closed Panels: Weapons of Mass Destruction: Non-Proliferation and Arms Control

Contribution ID: 170

Type: **Paper Abstract (Closed Panels)**

European defence policy changes in response to Russia's 2022 invasion of Ukraine: a 'wake-up call' in practice?

Russia's full-scale invasion of Ukraine would be expected to constitute an external shock sufficient to cause a dramatic transformation of the defence policies of European countries. Political leaders have frequently referred to this critical event as a 'wake-up call for Europe'. Yet, defence policy experts generally suggest that this perceived sense of urgency has not yet translated into a transformative development of European defence integration. Research indicates that defence policy remains primarily a matter of national importance. However, a comprehensive overview of the changes in the EU member states' and European NATO allies' national defence policies after February 2022 has not yet been compiled. This article aims to address this gap in empirical knowledge by triangulating the results of expert interviews with document analysis to assess changes in European defence policies on three dimensions: (1) European defence budgets and equipment investments, (2) the objectives of European defence policies and (3) defence cooperation among European states. Subsequently, it builds on literature on Foreign Policy Change and NATO burden-sharing to develop a theoretical framework aimed at explaining the (varying) impact of Russia's war against Ukraine on European defence policies.

What discipline or branch of humanities or social sciences do you identify yourself with?

Political Science, International and European Studies

If you are submitting an Open Panel proposal, have you included all four abstracts in attachment?

No, I am submitting a Closed Panel abstract

Are you a PhD student or early-career researcher?

Yes

Primary author: HAAS, Michelle

Co-authors: Mr VINDEVOGEL, Berk; Mr TAGHON, Servaas; Prof. HAESBROUCK, Tim

Presenter: HAAS, Michelle

Track Classification: Closed Panels: Defence Cooperation and Military Assistance

Contribution ID: 171

Type: **Poster Proposal**

European defence policy changes in response to Russia's 2022 invasion of Ukraine: a 'wake-up call' in practice?

Russia's full-scale invasion of Ukraine would be expected to constitute an external shock sufficient to cause a dramatic transformation of the defence policies of European countries. Political leaders have frequently referred to this critical event as a 'wake-up call for Europe'. Yet, defence policy experts generally suggest that this perceived sense of urgency has not yet translated into a transformative development of European defence integration. Research indicates that defence policy remains primarily a matter of national importance. However, a comprehensive overview of the changes in the EU member states' and European NATO allies' national defence policies after February 2022 has not yet been compiled. This article aims to address this gap in empirical knowledge by triangulating the results of expert interviews with document analysis to assess changes in European defence policies on three dimensions: (1) European defence budgets and equipment investments, (2) the objectives of European defence policies and (3) defence cooperation among European states. Subsequently, it builds on literature on Foreign Policy Change and NATO burden-sharing to develop a theoretical framework aimed at explaining the (varying) impact of Russia's war against Ukraine on European defence policies.

What discipline or branch of humanities or social sciences do you identify yourself with?

Political Science, International and European Studies

If you are submitting an Open Panel proposal, have you included all four abstracts in attachment?

No, I am submitting a Closed Panel abstract

Are you a PhD student or early-career researcher?

Yes

Primary author: Ms HAAS, Michelle

Co-authors: Mr VINDEVOGEL, Berk; Mr TAGHON, Servaas; Prof. HAESBROUCK, Tim

Presenter: Ms HAAS, Michelle

Track Classification: Poster Session

Contribution ID: 172

Type: **Paper Abstract (Closed Panels)**

International military assistance: a historical and conceptual genealogy

International Military Assistance (IMA) is undergoing a major revival in the light of the war in Ukraine, in which it is a fundamental marker, both in terms of the ability of the players to last in a war of attrition (Western support for Ukraine, North Korean and Iranian support for Russia) and as a means of indirect action for the benefit of the states providing the aid. While this case study is essential and will not fail to be referred to, this contribution aims to move beyond the specific case to examine International Military Assistance as a foreign policy tool. The purpose of this contribution is to carry out a conceptual and historical study of military assistance. It will then be seen that the common definition based on the four pillars of Train, Advise, Assist, and Equip is a protean implementation, strongly determined by the international context in which it takes place. An essential but not easy distinction with co-belligerence will be made, providing a welcome conceptual perspective for the other contributions on the panel, which will look at contemporary case studies in IMA. Finally, a brief presentation of the history of IMA will also be given to provide a comparative overview, both in terms of the evolution of doctrines (particularly since the founding American document of 1976 establishing the creation of Foreign Internal Defense dedicated to military assistance) and in terms of the variety of practices, from lease loans and the supply of equipment (cf. The Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949) to indirect intervention by foreign volunteers (ex: Spanish Civil War). In conclusion, this contribution is intended as a theoretical and historical characterization of IMA and defense cooperation, which will provide a conceptual introduction to the analysis of specific cases in the remainder of the panel.

What discipline or branch of humanities or social sciences do you identify yourself with?

Political Sciences - History

If you are submitting an Open Panel proposal, have you included all four abstracts in attachment?

No, I am submitting a Closed Panel abstract

Are you a PhD student or early-career researcher?

No

Primary author: FOUILLET, Thibault (Directeur Scientifique - Institut d'Etudes de Stratégie et de Défense, Université Jean Moulin Lyon III)

Presenter: FOUILLET, Thibault (Directeur Scientifique - Institut d'Etudes de Stratégie et de Défense, Université Jean Moulin Lyon III)

Track Classification: Closed Panels: Defence Cooperation and Military Assistance

Contribution ID: 173

Type: **Paper Abstract (Closed Panels)**

Winning the Battle for Hearts and Minds: U.S. Reassurance During the Russo-Ukrainian War

How effective were U.S. attempts at reassuring its allies and partners in the wake of the February 2022 Russian re-invasion of Ukraine? During this major crisis moment, the United States implemented a wide-ranging series of policies to support Ukraine, to deter Russia, and to reassure its NATO allies. These actions included broad sanctions, enhanced U.S. force presence in Central and Eastern Europe, and repeated verbal assurances. Yet these actions stopped short of a military intervention, with Washington refusing to impose a no-fly-zone or send forces to Ukraine. In handling this crisis, Washington had to contend with diverse allies and partners, who differed prior to the war on their willingness to engage with or to contain Russia. The United States thus faced a major reassurance challenge, the management of which could strengthen cohesion among its many partners or create major splits. Using surveys of public opinion in 23 countries on 6 continents, we evaluate whether and why U.S. reassurance efforts in the wake of the war succeeded. We find that the measured U.S. response to the crisis was generally lauded internationally. This finding shows that worries about the U.S. ability to balance the interests of NATO allies with those of its partners in East Asia and the Global South did not materialize.

What discipline or branch of humanities or social sciences do you identify yourself with?

Political Science

If you are submitting an Open Panel proposal, have you included all four abstracts in attachment?

Yes, I have included all required information (see below).

Are you a PhD student or early-career researcher?

No

Primary authors: LANOSZKA, Alexander; SUKIN, Lauren (London School of Economics and Political Science); Dr HERZOG, Stephen (ETH Zurich, Center for Security Studies/Harvard Kennedy School, Project on Managing the Atom)

Presenter: LANOSZKA, Alexander

Session Classification: Defence Cooperation and Military Assistance

Track Classification: Closed Panels: Defence Cooperation and Military Assistance

Contribution ID: 178

Type: **Paper Abstract (Closed Panels)**

EU's Use of Private Military and Security Companies' Services: Filling the Capabilities- and Consensus-Expectation Gaps?

Both academic studies and internal EU documents have established that contracting Private Military and Security Companies (PMSCs) services by the EU is nowadays a widespread practice, despite the persisting lack of EU-level regulation and significant divergence in Member States' national regulatory frameworks. PMSCs have been used primarily to support and sustain EU activities abroad, i.e. both civilian and military Common Security and Defence Policy missions and European External Action Service delegations and diplomatic missions. In this paper, we conduct a congruence test of two explanations for the use of PMSC services by the EU. First, building on Christopher Hill's "capabilities-expectations gap" concept, we examine whether PMSCs have been contracted to provide manpower that the EU and its member states lack completely or which they do not possess in sufficient quantity and/or quality when they are needed by an EU mission. Second, building on Asle Toje's "consensus-expectations gap" concept, we further explore whether PMSCs have been used to circumvent Member States' unwillingness to provide manpower that they actually possess, thereby helping circumvent existing political constraints on EU power projection abroad.

What discipline or branch of humanities or social sciences do you identify yourself with?

Security Studies/International Relations

If you are submitting an Open Panel proposal, have you included all four abstracts in attachment?

No, I am submitting a Closed Panel abstract

Are you a PhD student or early-career researcher?

No

Primary author: Prof. BURES, Oldrich (Center for Security Studies, Metropolitan University Prague)

Co-author: Prof. CUSUMANO, Eugenio (Università degli Studi di Messina)

Presenter: Prof. BURES, Oldrich (Center for Security Studies, Metropolitan University Prague)

Contribution ID: 179

Type: **Paper Abstract (Closed Panels)**

Hybrid axis of evil. Policing of organised crime and state threats in global ports

Since, the Russia-Ukraine conflict, particular concerns exist about disruption of energy supplies and transportation systems, including global ports, such as the Port of Rotterdam (Ornstein, 2022). While threats to critical infrastructures are not new (e.g. attacked ports during WWII), the contemporary situation is different: (digital) technology plays a key role in hybrid warfare, making the potential fallout for ports even bigger. The Netherlands has key global ports, including the Port of Rotterdam and North Sea Canal Area. These ports handle shipping and are important for energy distribution (NCTV, 2017). An attack on these ports could lead to a 'serious social disruption' for the Netherlands (NCTV, 2017, p. 1), and Europe more broadly. Especially the Port of Rotterdam has concerns due to more sanctions against Russia (Port of Rotterdam, 2022), and subsequently asks for a 'digital anti-aircraft defence' to fend off possible Russian cyberattacks in the port of Rotterdam (Ornstein, 2022). However, it remains unclear whether (cyber)attacks on ports can be attributed to other state actors, as well as that it remains unclear what really counts as an act of hybrid war and what role European maritime ports play in hybrid warfare. Hence, port policing should focus on a hybrid warfare scenario, next to the well-embedded tackling of organised crime; but is it status quo? This paper aims to dig into this question, using ethnographic data gathered between April 2022 and March 2023 in the Dutch ports of Rotterdam and the North Sea Canal Area/Port of Amsterdam. Moreover, this paper shall focus on the hybridized policing of organized crime and state/hybrid threats in the global port environments. There will be a focus as well on what hybridized policing as a topic implies for the interdisciplinary cross-pollination of criminology and security studies.

What discipline or branch of humanities or social sciences do you identify yourself with?

Criminology and public administration

If you are submitting an Open Panel proposal, have you included all four abstracts in attachment?

Yes, I have included all required information (see below).

Are you a PhD student or early-career researcher?

No

Primary author: Dr ESKI, Yarin (Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam)

Presenter: Dr ESKI, Yarin (Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam)

Contribution ID: 180

Type: **Paper Abstract (Closed Panels)**

Technocratic view of nuclear sharing

As a result of the pro-disarmament discourse stemming from the Humanitarian Turn in nuclear disarmament, there has been a growing salience of domestic voices in European countries which contribute to NATO's nuclear mission. At least prior to the Russia's invasion of Ukraine, many of these voices advocated for strong steps towards nuclear disarmament.

But how do the technocrats, who often shape the policy, view the public view; and how do they engage with it? Drawing on unique study of technocratic responses to nuclear sharing contestation in all five host nations in Europe, I advance a technocratic theory of nuclear sharing, which takes democratic responsiveness seriously. Drawing on the work in the field of political and democratic theory, I develop a model of technocratic response to political contestation; which I then test against existing empirical record.

What discipline or branch of humanities or social sciences do you identify yourself with?

International Relations

If you are submitting an Open Panel proposal, have you included all four abstracts in attachment?

No, I am submitting a Closed Panel abstract

Are you a PhD student or early-career researcher?

No

Primary author: ONDERCO, Michal (Erasmus University Rotterdam)

Presenter: ONDERCO, Michal (Erasmus University Rotterdam)

Session Classification: Weapons of Mass Destruction Non-Proliferation and Arms Control

Track Classification: Closed Panels: Weapons of Mass Destruction: Non-Proliferation and Arms Control

Contribution ID: 183

Type: **Paper Abstract (Closed Panels)**

Russian nuclear roulette? Elites and public debates on nuclear weapons in Moscow after Ukraine

How has Russia's invasion of Ukraine influenced domestic debates on nuclear strategy in Russia? Western scholars and analysts have voiced the concern that as Russian conventional capabilities deteriorate due to the war, its reliance on non-strategic nuclear weapons could grow. Contrary to this expectation, this article argues that a close reading of political and military elites' nuclear debates suggests more continuity than change in the role of nuclear weapons in Russia's security strategy. By analyzing the Kremlin's nuclear signaling, strategic deliberations among military elites, and public exchanges among policy analysts in the first 18 months of the war, it finds that there has been a significant increase in nuclear discourse at all these levels. Nevertheless, the select voices among policy analysts calling for a lowering of the nuclear threshold diverge from the signaling by the political leadership and the debates among military elites.

What discipline or branch of humanities or social sciences do you identify yourself with?

International Relations/ Security Studies

If you are submitting an Open Panel proposal, have you included all four abstracts in attachment?

No, I am submitting a Closed Panel abstract

Are you a PhD student or early-career researcher?

Yes

Primary author: WACHS, Lydia (Stockholm University)

Presenter: WACHS, Lydia (Stockholm University)

Session Classification: Weapons of Mass Destruction Non-Proliferation and Arms Control

Track Classification: Closed Panels: Weapons of Mass Destruction: Non-Proliferation and Arms Control

Contribution ID: 184

Type: **Paper Abstract (Closed Panels)**

The Eternal Promise of Missile Defense

Why do states continue to invest in military technologies that are ineffective or simply do not work? Despite nearly 70 years of research and development in the United States, missile defense continues to face high, if not insurmountable, technological challenges, is financially burdensome, and has resulted in negative outcomes for strategic stability. Hence, this paper asks: What explains the continued and widespread support for missile defense among American policymakers? Contrary to common arguments about American cultural features, public appeal, and organizational politics, I contend that the persistence of missile defense can be explained by two conditions: technological malleability and a framework of ignorance. In a context of deep uncertainty and high complexity, technology is malleable, meaning that policymakers can envision it to serve many different purposes and thus have some benefit for everyone. At the same time, discussions about technology take place under a framework of ignorance, which enables policymakers to overlook, downplay, and deny the costs associated with missile defense. This creates the illusion that investment in the technology is relatively cost-free. Using original interview and archival evidence, I contrast two crucial cases: the entrenchment of national missile defense during the Obama Administration (2008-2016) with the decision to limit the development and deployment of missile defense under the ABM Treaty during the Nixon Administration (1969-1972). Not only does this paper introduce two novel concepts—technological malleability and ignorance—into the study of international relations, but it has also important implications for other emerging technologies, such as artificial intelligence and cyber technology, that are bound to shape warfare in critical ways.

What discipline or branch of humanities or social sciences do you identify yourself with?

Political Science

If you are submitting an Open Panel proposal, have you included all four abstracts in attachment?

No, I am submitting a Closed Panel abstract

Are you a PhD student or early-career researcher?

Yes

Primary author: VERSCHUREN, Sanne (Boston University)**Presenter:** VERSCHUREN, Sanne (Boston University)**Session Classification:** Weapons of Mass Destruction Non-Proliferation and Arms Control

Track Classification: Closed Panels: Weapons of Mass Destruction: Non-Proliferation and Arms Control

Contribution ID: 185

Type: **Paper Abstract (Closed Panels)**

Unveiling Russian Intelligence Failures in the Ukraine Conflict: A Strategic Culture Perspective

Russia's invasion of Ukraine in February 2022 demonstrated many limits in its military, planning and intelligence structures. The low combat readiness and preparedness of its forces were matched by inadequate logistics. And overarching everything was intelligence –more precisely an intelligence failure. As many preliminary assessments of Russia's intelligence work before the invasion have illustrated, despite extensive efforts at significant cost Russia's intelligence machinery failed to provide its leadership with key data or crucial insights. These included assessment of Western response, Ukrainian public sentiment, the military capacity of the Ukrainian forces. They were supplemented by tactical and operational intelligence failures, particularly space-based intelligence. Russian forces frequently used Soviet-era road atlases and struggled to navigate or to find key targets. In Russia it has been customary to attribute poor performance to two factors: roads and fools. Both factors were at play in 2022, no doubt. But this article argues that there is more to Russia's poor intelligence performance. It argues that in order to understand it we must consider strategic culture, that inherited by the current core agencies, the FSB and the GRU, from the Soviet days. It explores elements of this strategic culture, based on material from Soviet era archives, before moving on to argue that the endemic corruption visible in the intelligence system, and its incapacity to give its customers unwelcome news, have their root in this culture. This is something that Russia will struggle to resolve –even as it rather successfully adapts other elements of its military and intelligence –as its roots are deep.

What discipline or branch of humanities or social sciences do you identify yourself with?

War Studies

If you are submitting an Open Panel proposal, have you included all four abstracts in attachment?

No, I am submitting a Closed Panel abstract

Are you a PhD student or early-career researcher?

Yes

Primary authors: GROSSFELD, Elena (King's College London); DYLAN, Huw (King's College London)

Presenters: GROSSFELD, Elena (King's College London); DYLAN, Huw (King's College London)

Session Classification: Intelligence

Track Classification: Closed Panels: Intelligence

Contribution ID: 186

Type: **Paper Abstract (Closed Panels)**

Multilateral Maritime Exercises and Strategic Change The American Case and Beyond

Thursday, 27 June 2024 11:20 (20 minutes)

Multilateral military exercises (MMEs) are largely ignored by scholars of international security, despite the fact that they tell us much about a state's strategic goals and contingency plans. They arguably serve as a better indicator of a state's intent than either studying discourse or policy documents alone or other metrics that are often invoked such as force structure, which may take decades to substantially alter. In that sense, they are a better predictor of where states intend to conduct humanitarian operations, manage crises or fight wars. Furthermore, their planning and execution represents a huge investment of any military's time and energy, often being described as the "meat and potatoes" of what military forces do. In sum, they matter in theoretical, policy and operational terms.

We examine that the role that maritime multilateral exercises play in the implementation of American grand strategy in three regions—Europe, the greater Middle East and the Indo-Pacific. First, we develop a conceptual framework, offering a threefold categorization of types and MMEs, and an explanation for why each might predominate in a particular region. Second, we explain why we focus on US-led exercises. We then discuss what MMEs can reveal about the evolving strategies of the last three American presidential administrations (Obama Trump, and Biden). Third, we examine our claims in the U.S.' primary three theaters of operation, examining variance both across the regions and within each region over time and perceptions of the operating environment has changed. Finally, we conclude by considering the potential for using this approach to study the grand strategies of other states) in a comparable manner.

What discipline or branch of humanities or social sciences do you identify yourself with?

Political Science

If you are submitting an Open Panel proposal, have you included all four abstracts in attachment?

Yes, I have included all required information (see below).

Are you a PhD student or early-career researcher?

No

Primary author: Prof. REICH, Simon (Rutgers University)**Co-author:** DOMBROWSKI, Peter**Presenters:** DOMBROWSKI, Peter; Prof. REICH, Simon (Rutgers University)**Session Classification:** Defence Cooperation and Military Assistance

Track Classification: Closed Panels: Defence Cooperation and Military Assistance

Contribution ID: 187

Type: **Paper Abstract (Closed Panels)**

Temporal Disparities in Intergenerational Justice: A Comparative Analysis of Nuclear Deterrence and Climate Change

Nuclear weapons and climate change put future generations in the wrong by externalizing potential long-term harm and constraining their freedom of choice through extended policy trajectories. Focused on nuclear weapons, this article conducts a comparative analysis of intergenerational justice concerns in both contexts. The principal argument emphasizes the distinct temporality of these challenges, revealing three crucial temporal disparities.

First, the externalization of intergenerational harm follows different timelines. Climate-related risks intensify across successive generations, while the risk of future generations navigating the aftermath of nuclear war accumulates over the long term, becoming more likely over extended periods compared to shorter ones. Second, the sustainability of present generations' incentives to prioritize immediate benefits over future generations' well-being varies. The appeal of fossil fuels is expected to wane over time in the climate context, whereas perceived benefits of nuclear deterrence are likely to endure. Third, while the visual salience of the intergenerational implications of nuclear weapons is diminishing, the gradual impacts of climate change are becoming increasingly evident.

Comparing how intergenerational injustice unfolds through continued reliance on nuclear deterrence and climate change not only highlights the oversight of intergenerational justice in nuclear ethics debates, but also carves out the distinct nature of intergenerational justice concerns in the context of nuclear weapons. Derived from this comparative analysis, a more nuanced understanding of intergenerational injustice in nuclear weapons facilitates a critical examination of mitigation and rectification strategies.

What discipline or branch of humanities or social sciences do you identify yourself with?

Political Science

If you are submitting an Open Panel proposal, have you included all four abstracts in attachment?

No, I am submitting a Closed Panel abstract

Are you a PhD student or early-career researcher?

Yes

Primary author: STÄRK, Franziska (Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy at the University of Hamburg (IFSH))

Presenter: STÄRK, Franziska (Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy at the University of Hamburg (IFSH))

Session Classification: Weapons of Mass Destruction Non-Proliferation and Arms Control

Track Classification: Closed Panels: Weapons of Mass Destruction: Non-Proliferation and Arms Control

Contribution ID: 188

Type: **Paper Abstract (Closed Panels)**

The Imperative for Mass and the Offense-Defense Balance: Survivability and Attrition in Air Warfare

This paper aims to study the extent with which the return of combat mass in air warfare is shifting the offense-defense balance among great powers. The scholarly and technical literature on air warfare has so far emphasized the game-changing impact of stealth and precision-guidance technology, both of which had replaced the role of mass and shifted the offense-defense balance toward the offense in the final stages and immediate aftermath of the Cold War. However, in the late 2000s and early 2010s, improvements in integrated air defense systems (IADS) technology led by increased access to commercial technology has redefined the importance of mass. Modern IADS operate on data-fusion networking configurations, have longer ranges, more mobility, better countermeasures, and are available in greater numbers. These quantitative and qualitative developments in IADS drove up the costs of suppression of enemy air defenses (SEAD) operations due to the larger number of aimpoints and the effectiveness of air defenses. In response, great powers are investing in lower-cost offensive platforms that can create combat mass to overwhelm and attrit enemy IADS. To what extent are these investments shifting the offense-defense balance among great powers? To answer this question, we focus on two case studies: Russia's use of Iranian-made loitering munitions in Ukraine and U.S. efforts to develop collaborative combat aircraft through the low-cost attritable aircraft concept and the resulting Skyborg Project. By investigating the intricacies of these developments, this paper contributes to a still-underexplored area of research which is being largely shaped by new trends in air warfare. Assessing the new role of combat mass and its broader implications for international security can offer valuable insights into the transformation of military technology and warfare.

What discipline or branch of humanities or social sciences do you identify yourself with?

International Relations

If you are submitting an Open Panel proposal, have you included all four abstracts in attachment?

No, I am submitting a Closed Panel abstract

Are you a PhD student or early-career researcher?

Yes

Primary author: BORGES, Lauro (University of Minho)

Presenter: BORGES, Lauro (University of Minho)

Session Classification: Military Technology

Track Classification: Closed Panels: Military Technology

Contribution ID: 189

Type: **Paper Abstract (Closed Panels)**

Organizational Lineage and the Diffusion of Lethal and Non-Lethal Information between Armed Groups

How does tactical, organizational, and other information pass between armed groups? Existing research overwhelmingly focuses on observable links like alliances, training camps, and shared foreign patrons. Yet, information is also passed via organizational lineage through processes of splitting, merging, and membership migration. Focusing on organizational splitting in particular, we test this argument with a case study of Republican armed groups in Ireland and Northern Ireland, and by statically forecasting how organizational linkages shape patterns of tactical diffusion between groups. The results confirm our expectations and they underscore the critical role of organizational lineage in the diffusion of information between groups. This has important ramifications for how researchers model the dynamics of armed groups particularly as they relate to operational capacity, tactical innovation, and future trajectory.

What discipline or branch of humanities or social sciences do you identify yourself with?

Political Science

If you are submitting an Open Panel proposal, have you included all four abstracts in attachment?

No, I am submitting a Closed Panel abstract

Are you a PhD student or early-career researcher?

No

Primary author: PERKOSKI, Evan (University of Connecticut)

Presenter: PERKOSKI, Evan (University of Connecticut)

Session Classification: Terrorism and Counter-Terrorism

Track Classification: Closed Panels: Terrorism and Counter-Terrorism

Contribution ID: 191

Type: **Paper Abstract (Closed Panels)**

Military intervention in foreign policy-making: Principal-agent analysis of US troop withdrawal from Korea, 1977–1979

After the Vietnam War, the United States attempted to reduce its troop levels, which led to a deterioration of the South Korea-US alliance. However, little attention has been paid to the Carter administration's ultimately unsuccessful attempt at withdrawal. This paper examines why civil-military preferences clashed and how this led to the failure of President Carter's complete withdrawal of US ground forces from Korea. Previous studies suggesting that US foreign policy patterns and strategic interests determined the withdrawal of US forces stationed abroad have not provided a coherent account of the domestic determinants of withdrawal failure, in particular the intervention of military elites. An alternative but essential factor to consider is civil-military relations. Even in mature democracies such as the United States, the foreign and national security policy preferences of civilian leaders and military elites can differ significantly. In such cases, military elites have resisted presidential foreign policy leadership through various political tactics and alliances with Congress. This paper develops a dual principal-agent model and causal process tracing to trace the trajectory of strategic interactions between the president, Congress, and military elites. In doing so, this paper demonstrates how US military elites can undermine presidential supremacy over US foreign policy.

What discipline or branch of humanities or social sciences do you identify yourself with?

Politics and International Relations

If you are submitting an Open Panel proposal, have you included all four abstracts in attachment?

No, I am submitting a Closed Panel abstract

Are you a PhD student or early-career researcher?

Yes

Primary author: PARK, Juhong (University of Bath)

Presenter: PARK, Juhong (University of Bath)

Session Classification: Military Interventions

Track Classification: Closed Panels: Military Interventions

Contribution ID: 192

Type: Paper Abstract (Closed Panels)

Getting the Revolution in Intelligence Affairs Right: Technological Innovation, Organizational and Operational Adaptation, and Intelligence Effectiveness in the Second Machine Age

Many today believe that developments in Artificial Intelligence (AI), sensors, and automation presage the coming of a 'Revolution in Intelligence Affairs' with far-reaching consequences on the performance of intelligence systems. RIA proponents advocate vast-scale acquisition of AI, state-of-the-art sensors, and automation technologies; support swift organizational and operational changes fostering integration between the various stages of the intelligence cycle; recommend development of operational concepts for human-machine teaming. In such a view, intelligence organizations embracing the RIA will be capable of collecting, analyzing, and disseminating information at such scope, speed, and scale as to enable decision-makers to leverage 'decision advantage' on an almost continuous basis in the conduct of statecraft.

How would such a transformation affect intelligence performance? We do not know, as scholars and experts advancing the RIA construct have assumed rather than demonstrated increases in effectiveness and scholarship has paid only scant attention to the impact of 'technological revolutions' on the functioning of intelligence systems.

This paper argues that the RIA will yield results incrementally and unevenly, providing an answer in four steps. It first defines the RIA construct and identifies the causal mechanisms underpinning it by reviewing scholarship on the integration of advanced ICT into intelligence systems. Secondly, it develops a theory of intelligence power, by inductively deriving measures of effectiveness for the key intelligence functions from historical studies and grey literature. Third, it conducts an in-depth within case empirical analysis of the implementation of the RIA employing the Israeli intelligence between the late-1990s and 2014 as a case study. Fourth and last, it uses the intelligence power theory to test the actual performance of the RIA construct taking advantage of the extraordinary insights provided by the 2017 special report of the Israeli State Comptroller on the conduct of the 2014 war, which is based on official intelligence records.

What discipline or branch of humanities or social sciences do you identify yourself with?

Political Science/History

If you are submitting an Open Panel proposal, have you included all four abstracts in attachment?

No, I am submitting a Closed Panel abstract

Are you a PhD student or early-career researcher?

No

Primary author: Dr PETRELLI, Niccolò (Roma Tre University)

Presenter: Dr PETRELLI, Niccolò (Roma Tre University)

Session Classification: Intelligence

Track Classification: Closed Panels: Intelligence

Contribution ID: 194

Type: **Poster Proposal**

Investigating Perspectives of (In)Security of Affected Individuals in Afghanistan under The Taliban Rule: A Vernacular Security Approach

The research investigates security perceptions and coping strategies among Afghan citizens experienced living in Afghanistan under Taliban rule post-August 2021, employing a vernacular security approach. This approach explores how individuals construct, understand, and experience (in)security in their daily lives, offering a bottom-up perspective often overlooked in mainstream security studies.

Through qualitative online interviews conducted via platforms like WhatsApp, the study captures the multifaceted nature of insecurity experienced by ordinary Afghan citizens after the Taliban's return to power. It encompasses issues related to physical safety, socio-economic stability, preservation of personal freedoms, and psychological well-being. Preliminary findings show that individuals navigate these challenges through adaptive strategies, including altering living arrangements, installing security measures, changing transportation routines, and seeking refuge abroad. The sources of insecurity are diverse, stemming from both state and non-state actors. Threats range from physical harm, such as abduction and theft, to more subtle forms of coercion and control imposed by the Taliban regime.

In sum, emphasizing the importance of a Vernacular Approach, the research sheds light on security dynamics within authoritarian regimes like Taliban-controlled Afghanistan. Negotiating with non-elite individuals enriches our understanding and informs policies aimed at addressing insecurity and fostering resilience within affected communities.

What discipline or branch of humanities or social sciences do you identify yourself with?

International Development

If you are submitting an Open Panel proposal, have you included all four abstracts in attachment?

No, I am submitting a Closed Panel abstract

Are you a PhD student or early-career researcher?

Yes

Primary author: IRAJ, Mohammad Mahdi (Nagoya University)

Presenter: IRAJ, Mohammad Mahdi (Nagoya University)

Track Classification: Poster Session

Contribution ID: 196

Type: **Paper Abstract (Closed Panels)**

Strategic sensemaking: Scanning the military technological edge

Increased strategic competition over technology puts defence innovation at the forefront of current national security and defence policy strategizing. A central issue in the defence innovation debate is how different types of countries –from advanced major powers such as the US, over catching-up states like China to middling powers such as Russia, Iran and India, and finally to small countries, often advanced innovators like Israel and Singapore –organise their defence innovation systems. Filling a gap in the literature which focuses on either great powers or small but great innovators, this article reconstructs the logic of strategic sensemaking in defence innovation for small states without a particularly strong defence and innovation portfolio. For small states who are unable to either develop advanced defence materiel on their own or to participate in but a few of the leading international (allied and partner) capability development programmes, technology scouting –scanning the military technological edge –is both crucial to their strategic sensemaking. We reconstruct three modes of technology scouting as integral to national defence planning and capability development decision-making. The argument adds to the academic agenda of defence innovation and the global technological aspects of strategic competition, and is relevant to policy makers redesigning defence innovation and materiel policies.

What discipline or branch of humanities or social sciences do you identify yourself with?

international relations / international security studies / strategic studies

If you are submitting an Open Panel proposal, have you included all four abstracts in attachment?

No, I am submitting a Closed Panel abstract

Are you a PhD student or early-career researcher?

No

Primary authors: BREITENBAUCH, Henrik (Royal Danish Defence College); Mr VESTERLUND MATHIESEN, Jens (Royal Danish Defence College)

Presenter: BREITENBAUCH, Henrik (Royal Danish Defence College)

Contribution ID: 197

Type: **Paper Abstract (Closed Panels)**

Artificial Intelligence and Non-linearity: An Analysis of the Limitations of Statistical Learning AI in Warfare

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is poised to have a deep transformative effect on the character of war. While discussions on military AI predominantly centered on the implications of Lethal Autonomous Weapons Systems (LAWS), empirical evidence highlights that AI applications extend beyond the notion of “killer robots”, especially in the form of decision-support and Lethal Targeting Assistance software. This is shown in these systems’ increasing presence in contemporary conflicts, as exemplified by the Russo-Ukrainian war and the conflict between Israel and Hamas.

However, the existing body of literature in Security Studies investigating military AI usually falls short of comprehensively understanding the functioning, advantages, and limitations of statistical learning-based algorithms underpinning current AI systems. This hinders the effective study of military AI and often leads to tendencies of technological determinism and overestimation of AI’s actual role and capabilities in warfare. This research seeks to address this pitfall by integrating Strategic Studies literature with knowledge from the field of Machine Learning to understand whether current AI systems are capable of facing war on their own devices.

This research aims to demonstrate the limitations of statistical learning-based AI in warfare by drawing on Security Studies literature to identify the set of capabilities required to effectively address the inherently nonlinear and chaotic nature of warfare. Subsequently, these capabilities will be tested against the heuristics and main tenets of Machine Learning. By doing so, this research provides technically informed insight into the suitability of AI in warfare, shedding light on its actual limitations and potential. The central argument posits that current AI systems are not ready to be deployed autonomously and without human judgment, as they rely on an inductive type of reasoning based on dataset analysis that is ill-suited to face the complex and unpredictable nature of warfare.

What discipline or branch of humanities or social sciences do you identify yourself with?

Security Studies

If you are submitting an Open Panel proposal, have you included all four abstracts in attachment?

No, I am submitting a Closed Panel abstract

Are you a PhD student or early-career researcher?

Yes

Primary author: Ms RUSSO, Alessandra (Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore (Milan))

Presenter: Ms RUSSO, Alessandra (Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore (Milan))

Session Classification: Military Technology

Track Classification: Closed Panels: Military Technology

Contribution ID: 199

Type: **Poster Proposal**

"In the mind of the beholder": a study on coercion and the choice of coercive instruments

Why and how are states inclined towards strategic preferences in foreign policy? Why do they prefer certain instruments of coercion over others? Part of IR scholarship advocates that a strategic culture approach offers highly relevant perspectives on foreign policy decision-making. The project seeks to investigate the role of strategic culture when it comes to coerce an adversary. From a theoretical perspective, it treats strategic culture as a companion theory, pulling together a traditional interest in power politics with subjectivity. Relying on this background, it builds an analytical framework, based on the assumption that strategic culture shapes the way in which states conceptualize coercion, and disposes them towards preferring certain tools over others. The project then provides three empirical illustrations: Russia, Turkey, and India. The analysis employs a mixed-methods approach, using security documents on coercion as text-as-data, and qualitative interviews with relevant academic and policy experts. The project further contributes to the research on strategic culture and coercion, which remains relatively underdeveloped in strategic studies. Moreover, it provides additional insights on the countries under study, which find relevant academic and policy implications. Lastly, it brings in the use of computational methods, which still have few applications in security studies.

What discipline or branch of humanities or social sciences do you identify yourself with?

International Relations; Strategic Studies

If you are submitting an Open Panel proposal, have you included all four abstracts in attachment?

No, I am submitting a Closed Panel abstract

Are you a PhD student or early-career researcher?

Yes

Primary author: BOLDRINI, Chiara

Presenter: BOLDRINI, Chiara

Track Classification: Poster Session

Contribution ID: 201

Type: **Paper Abstract (Closed Panels)**

The Utility of Foreign Volunteers in Ukraine

The Russian full-scale invasion of Ukraine supposedly marks the return of the paradigmatic conventional high-intensity warfare, thus calling into question the past two decades of irregular conflict. Upon closer inspection, however, the war in Ukraine also exhibits several continuities, including the fact that non-citizens are fighting on behalf of both conflict parties. This paper examines the role of such volunteers in the Ukrainian war effort. Based on a review of the existing literature, our study argues that there is a need for a distinction between regular and irregular foreign volunteers. The paper then proposes a novel typology of such volunteers, based on their host's legal status as well as their organizational capacity. Through a number of case studies including the International Legion, Chechen volunteer battalions as well as the Russian Volunteer Corps, and by comparing them to previous conflicts, the paper examines the utility of foreign volunteers for Ukraine. Its findings indicate that the Ukrainian experience largely confirms historical trends: Foreign volunteers are primarily useful for strategic messaging and garnering international attention. Meanwhile, their impact at the operational and tactical level is limited, with irregular volunteers having a higher probability than regular ones to affect battlefield outcomes. On the other hand, the Ukrainian case also shows some nuances with regard to the International Legion neither fitting the irregular nor regular volunteer category neatly as well as the attainment of deniability by using Russian volunteer groups carrying out cross-border raids.

What discipline or branch of humanities or social sciences do you identify yourself with?

History and Political Science

If you are submitting an Open Panel proposal, have you included all four abstracts in attachment?

No, I am submitting a Closed Panel abstract

Are you a PhD student or early-career researcher?

Yes

Primary author: Mr PARCELS, Zachariah (Purdue University)

Co-author: WYSS, Michel (Strategic Studies, Military Academy at ETH Zurich)

Presenter: Mr PARCELS, Zachariah (Purdue University)

Contribution ID: 202

Type: **Paper Abstract (Closed Panels)**

Winning the Battle of Adaptation

Russia's invasion of Ukraine on 24 February 2022 inaugurated a high-intensity prolonged conventional war that has since become stalemated. Recent Russian and Ukrainian offensives have failed to achieve meaningful territorial advances. The fate of the war increasingly hinges on each sides' ability to adapt and innovate—particularly for Ukraine where the early loss of territory and dependence on western aid create vulnerabilities for strategic loss in a context of military draw. This project is collecting extensive new data on how Ukrainian military adaptation collected from research trips to Ukraine, compilation of open sources, and interviews with Ukrainian experts and decision-makers. Early analysis suggests that Ukraine's approach to adaptation largely depends on the decentralized efforts of individual military units collaborating with a dense network of civil society organizations. For example, Ukraine's success innovating drones that inflict disproportionate damage on Russian forces is a case in point. Drones collective and amateur workshops have led the way modifying commercial drones for military operations. Civil society organizations then spearheaded the training of 35,000 Ukrainian drone pilots. Close informal relations between individual military units and these outside actors have fostered rapid feedback loops between soldiers at the front and technicians in the rear. However, there are drawbacks to Ukraine's decentralized approach including that policymakers lack adequate mechanisms for identifying and funneling resources to the most successful developments. Limited resources are also dispersed across multiple organizations that duplicate one another's efforts.

What discipline or branch of humanities or social sciences do you identify yourself with?

Political Science

If you are submitting an Open Panel proposal, have you included all four abstracts in attachment?

No, I am submitting a Closed Panel abstract

Are you a PhD student or early-career researcher?

No

Primary author: Dr DEVORE, Marc (University of St. Andrews)**Co-author:** HARKNESS, Kristen (University of St. Andrews)**Presenters:** HARKNESS, Kristen (University of St. Andrews); Dr DEVORE, Marc (University of St. Andrews)**Track Classification:** Closed Panels: Military Technology

Contribution ID: 205

Type: **Paper Abstract (Closed Panels)**

Can there be a responsible nuclear weapon state? Understanding the agency and moral relevance of nuclear weapons

This article reviews competing understandings of the agency and moral relevance of nuclear weapons for international politics among two incommensurable worldviews in global nuclear politics: hegemonic nuclearism and subaltern anti-nuclearism. It argues that what (if anything) is considered a responsible nuclear weapon state largely depends on implicit assumptions about the agency and moral relevance of nuclear weapons. Despite the enormous growth in research related to nuclear deterrence, the available evidence remains ambiguous and inconclusive allowing for competing interpretations about the efficacy and reliability of nuclear deterrence and the co-existence of various "nuclear ontologies" (Ritchie 2022). After introducing the concepts of action schemes and second-order responsibility, the article analyzes how the two ontologies understand the agency of nuclear weapons for international politics. Whereas hegemonic nuclearism places emphasis on the instrumental role of nuclear weapons for deterrence and stability, subaltern anti-nuclearism pays much greater attention to unintended ways in which nuclear weapons shape the sets of options available to human agents, including the inherent risk of inadvertent escalation, the opportunity costs of nuclear deterrence, and the extremely unequal distribution of security benefits from nuclear deterrence. From a subaltern anti-nuclearist perspective, the diminished human agency in nuclear deterrence provides little need to distinguish responsible from irresponsible nuclear weapon states based on their identity and intentions. Instead, subaltern anti-nuclearism deems nuclear possession itself problematic in the sense of second-order responsibility. The article contributes to a growing literature seeking to operationalize and engage with notions of responsibility in relation to nuclear weapons and explores the ontological foundations of competing discourses in global nuclear politics.

What discipline or branch of humanities or social sciences do you identify yourself with?

Political science

If you are submitting an Open Panel proposal, have you included all four abstracts in attachment?

No, I am submitting a Closed Panel abstract

Are you a PhD student or early-career researcher?

Yes

Primary author: THIES, Tim (Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy at the University of Hamburg)

Presenter: THIES, Tim (Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy at the University of Hamburg)

Session Classification: Weapons of Mass Destruction Non-Proliferation and Arms Control

Track Classification: Closed Panels: Weapons of Mass Destruction: Non-Proliferation and Arms Control

Contribution ID: 211

Type: **Paper Abstract (Closed Panels)**

The financing of contemporary mercenarism: resources, routes, and regulation

In recent years the operations of mercenaries and other comparable service providers such as private military and security companies (PMSC), have come to light more frequently, nevertheless there are still many unanswered questions surrounding the phenomena. The relevant regulatory frameworks, are of limited use given the changes in the nature of these actors and how they have been used in recent decades. Attention has been paid to, for instance, recruitment practices and the involvement of mercenaries and PMSC in non-international armed conflicts, but there are still issues that remain opaque. The financing of mercenarism is one area of concern. While the connections between mercenaries and PMSC and the exploitation of natural resources are well known, less is known about the intermediaries, routes, and resources involved in funding mercenarism. What is clear is that financing methods have evolved, especially in light of the growing significance of cryptocurrencies. This paper examines the channels exploited by mercenaries, their clients, and enablers, and questions whether existing regulatory provisions around the financing of mercenaries and related actors are fit for purpose.

What discipline or branch of humanities or social sciences do you identify yourself with?

International Relations and International Law

If you are submitting an Open Panel proposal, have you included all four abstracts in attachment?

No, I am submitting a Closed Panel abstract

Are you a PhD student or early-career researcher?

No

Primary author: JEZDIMIROVIC RANITO, Jovana (University of Twente)

Co-author: MACLEOD, Sorcha (University of Copenhagen)

Presenters: JEZDIMIROVIC RANITO, Jovana (University of Twente); MACLEOD, Sorcha (University of Copenhagen)

Contribution ID: 212

Type: **Paper Abstract (Closed Panels)**

Exploring the cybersecurity policy design space in the EU: a mixed methods approach based on machine-learning techniques

Social scientists are increasingly focusing on the factors that explain the development, organisation, and enforcement of cybersecurity capabilities. However, a systematic analysis of these capabilities in terms of the policy instruments used has not been attempted so far. Which policy instruments can actors use? How do they vary between the institutions? How can the variation in the availability and use of capabilities be explained? This paper aims to answer these research questions using text-as-data techniques to analyse policy documents of EU Member States and European institutions.

Reviewing the literature concerning the different phases of cybersecurity policy design, I develop a set of hypotheses within a general theoretical framework. I use mixed methods to cross-validate hypotheses and refine the theoretical framework. The data used are policy documents from 1990 to 2023, sourced from the online libraries of the UN, NATO, EU, and Member States, focusing on the cybersecurity policy sub-areas of Defence, Crime, Diplomacy, and Resilience. The identification of the policy instruments and the actors involved is conducted using Named Entity Recognition (NER) in the documents. Furthermore, I combine NER with a machine-learning method for estimating bureaucratic constraint variation to consider potential effects on implementation. Upon obtaining numerical values that represent the variety and frequency of policy instruments, I assess the consistency of the models corresponding to hypotheses through regression analysis.

The findings offer a comparative analysis of state policy instruments within the EU's supranational framework.

The paper's contributions are threefold: it provides a method for analysing the policies of individual states, considering the influence of supra-national frameworks, replicable in other policy areas; this methodological contribution follows the development of a theoretical framework that combines the literature of IR, policy analysis, IPE, and organisational studies in the field of cybersecurity; and it provides a systematisation of European cybersecurity policy documents.

What discipline or branch of humanities or social sciences do you identify yourself with?

Strategic Studies

If you are submitting an Open Panel proposal, have you included all four abstracts in attachment?

No, I am submitting a Closed Panel abstract

Are you a PhD student or early-career researcher?

Yes

Primary author: SGUAZZINI, Mattia (University of Genova, Italy)

Presenter: SGUAZZINI, Mattia (University of Genova, Italy)

Contribution ID: 214

Type: **Paper Abstract (Closed Panels)**

The inadmissibility of nuclear threats – norm or empty promise?

In 1996, the International Court of Justice was unable to “conclude definitively whether the threat or use of nuclear weapons would be lawful or unlawful in an extreme circumstance of self-defence, in which the very survival of a State would be at stake”. This highly nuanced legal (non-)condemnation of nuclear threats came after decades of the Cold War, which was characterised by nuclear threats, but also decades of efforts to stigmatise nuclear weapons in general and nuclear threats in particular. The latter culminated, for example, in Article 1(d) of the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons, which prohibits signatories from threatening to use nuclear weapons. Nevertheless, over the past decade, we’ve seen a normalisation of escalatory nuclear rhetoric through the rise of populism and authoritarian emboldenment. A universal norm against nuclear threats has yet to manifest, and nuclear armed states have been the persistent objectors.

In November 2002, however, the G20 Bali Declaration of November declared the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons “inadmissible”. What is striking about this declaration is that there was no disagreement on this language, even though the group includes six nuclear armed states, their allies and partner countries that base (part of) their security strategies on nuclear deterrence. The credible threat to use nuclear weapons is integral for nuclear deterrence as practised by nine nuclear armed states. It’s also noteworthy that one member (Russia) has recently been heavily and widely criticised for its thinly veiled nuclear threats in the context of its war of aggression against Ukraine.

Does this indicate a strengthening norm against nuclear threats? And what implications does this have for deterrence and progress towards nuclear disarmament? This paper aims to examine the emergence and strength of the norm against nuclear threats through historical discourse analysis and process tracing.

What discipline or branch of humanities or social sciences do you identify yourself with?

Political Science

If you are submitting an Open Panel proposal, have you included all four abstracts in attachment?

No, I am submitting a Closed Panel abstract

Are you a PhD student or early-career researcher?

Yes

Primary author: VIELUF, Maren (University of Innsbruck)

Presenter: VIELUF, Maren (University of Innsbruck)

Session Classification: Weapons of Mass Destruction Non-Proliferation and Arms Control

Track Classification: Closed Panels: Weapons of Mass Destruction: Non-Proliferation and Arms Control

Contribution ID: 217

Type: **Paper Abstract (Closed Panels)**

Business power and the quiet politics of military innovation in cyberspace

This paper seeks to investigate whether and how cybersecurity firms have possibly gained business power over democratic governments in the digital age? First, we propose an interaction-oriented view to approach the public-private coordination of how to secure cyberspace. Public and private actors need to agree on policies; and the one with lower costs of non-agreement arguably achieves the more desired outcomes. Second, we suggest a baseline model that combines two conditions shaping these costs of non-agreement and thus business power: (I) Do cybersecurity firms have either a specific expertise or a large amount of general resources at their disposal? (II) Is power bargaining either exercised through more formalized coordination (e.g. civilian markets) or rather through informal arrangements (e.g. military markets)? Third, we engage in an empirical stock-taking exercise of mapping the private suppliers of USCYBERCOM since 2018. We gathered more than 250 contracts from <https://www.usaspending.gov/> to reveal USCYBERCOM's most important contractors; to identify the most relevant services and to assess the extent of competition on these markets. Moreover, we explored the suppliers' geographical location as well as their attributes and the primary markets that they were involved in. By drawing on this extensive empirical evidence, we suggest that the substantial share of non-competitive tendering increasingly normalizes quiet politics; and, therefore, provides manifold opportunities for the possibly 'unwarranted influence' of business power on how to secure cyberspace. In sum, this paper seeks to contribute to both the better understanding of funding innovative military technologies and the more generalizable politics of public-private coordination in international security in the digital age.

What discipline or branch of humanities or social sciences do you identify yourself with?

Political Science

If you are submitting an Open Panel proposal, have you included all four abstracts in attachment?

No, I am submitting a Closed Panel abstract

Are you a PhD student or early-career researcher?

No

Primary author: WEISS, Moritz (LMU Munich)

Co-author: Mr KRIEGER, Nico (LMU Munich)

Presenter: WEISS, Moritz (LMU Munich)

Session Classification: Military Technology

Track Classification: Closed Panels: Military Technology

Contribution ID: 219

Type: **Paper Abstract (Closed Panels)**

Military Intervention through surrogates

In today's multipolar and interconnected world, states often use surrogates in order to pursue their interests and expand their influence, while staying underneath the threshold of direct conventional war with a great power competitor. This paper proposes a conceptualization of surrogates that includes all human actors that patrons, who can be both state or non-state actors, delegate some or all of the burden of warfare to. Surrogates could thus be other states, non-state actors, or private military companies.

The paper will then explore how surrogates can be used for strategic advantage in a military intervention in the context of great power competition. The idea of victory in great power competition, and what strategies may lead to success will be analysed, as well as different strategies and approaches great powers use to compete with one another, such as gray zone warfare or hybrid warfare. The concept will be applied to the case of the great power competition between the US and Russia, looking specifically at their use of surrogates in the conflicts Ukraine and Syria. Their grand strategy as well as their goals and strategies in great power competition with one another will be studied, as well their use of surrogates to achieve said goals.

What discipline or branch of humanities or social sciences do you identify yourself with?

Defence Studies

If you are submitting an Open Panel proposal, have you included all four abstracts in attachment?

No, I am submitting a Closed Panel abstract

Are you a PhD student or early-career researcher?

Yes

Primary author: VON FELBERT, Leontine (King's College London)

Presenter: VON FELBERT, Leontine (King's College London)

Session Classification: Military Interventions

Track Classification: Closed Panels: Military Interventions

Contribution ID: 220

Type: **Paper Abstract (Closed Panels)**

When Does Vladimir Putin Send Troops to Fight Abroad?

This paper explores what drove Vladimir Putin's decisions to send troops on combat missions to foreign countries since his ascent to the Russian presidency on the last day of 1999. The author will first infer hypothetical drivers of Putin's decisions to send troops to fight abroad from the academic literature on the subject. He will then explore whether any of the inferred drivers have been present in instances when, as the evidence that will be presented in this paper demonstrates, Putin has deliberated whether to order such an intervention. The author will examine a total of nine such instances, including six in which the Russian leader decided to send troops to fight abroad, and three in which he chose not to. This examination will aim to reveal what confluence of conditions has been both necessary and sufficient for the Kremlin autocrat to order a military intervention in a foreign country. Ascertaining this confluence would constitute a modest contribution to the body of academic knowledge about the use of force by post-Soviet Russia against other countries, in the author's view. The paper's findings may also be of practical use for policymakers whose job it is, to paraphrase Winston Churchill's 1939 adage, to unwrap the riddle in a mystery inside an enigma in order to forecast to you forceful actions of Russia against other countries.

What discipline or branch of humanities or social sciences do you identify yourself with?

war studies

If you are submitting an Open Panel proposal, have you included all four abstracts in attachment?

No, I am submitting a Closed Panel abstract

Are you a PhD student or early-career researcher?

No

Primary author: SARADZHYAN, Simon (Harvard)

Presenter: SARADZHYAN, Simon (Harvard)

Session Classification: Military Interventions

Track Classification: Closed Panels: Military Interventions

Contribution ID: 221

Type: **Paper Abstract (Closed Panels)**

The Re-Emergence of Nuclear-Weapons-Free-Zones in an Era of Heightened Conflict

The strength of Nuclear-Weapons-Free-Zones (NWFZs) is put to the test as global strategic stability falters from conflict between Nuclear Weapons States (NWS). Currently, five NWFZs are legitimized by treaties that span large regions including Africa and South America (Goldblat, 1997; Green, 2009). This prominence is explained by the historic utilization of NWFZs as a diplomatic tool for countries championing nuclear disarmament—for example, many Middle Eastern countries push for an NWFZ to pressure Israel to destroy its alleged nuclear arsenal (Bahgat, 2007). However, as tensions heighten between NWS in crises such as Ukraine and North Korea, a new conceptual framework for understanding the importance of NWFZs stems from the differentiation between “stationing” and “proliferating” nuclear weapons in Non-Nuclear Weapons States (NNWS). As norms surrounding stationing nuclear weapons within NNWS weaken, NWFZs will play a more prominent role in keeping certain areas of the world nuclear-free. Understanding this role could prove vital to both long-term disarmament and nonproliferation goals. The paper will explore the conceptual importance of NWFZs in an attempt to modernize relevant frameworks developed in the late-1990s and early-2000s. The paper considers the historical value of NWFZs and argues that a re-emergence of the diplomatic power of NWFZs will occur due to heightened and more direct conflict between NWS over the next decade.

What discipline or branch of humanities or social sciences do you identify yourself with?

Politics and International Studies

If you are submitting an Open Panel proposal, have you included all four abstracts in attachment?

No, I am submitting a Closed Panel abstract

Are you a PhD student or early-career researcher?

Yes

Primary author: MOHAN, Janani (Cambridge University)

Presenter: MOHAN, Janani (Cambridge University)

Session Classification: Weapons of Mass Destruction Non-Proliferation and Arms Control

Track Classification: Closed Panels: Weapons of Mass Destruction: Non-Proliferation and Arms Control

Contribution ID: 225

Type: **Panel Proposal (Open Panels)**

Actors, Interests and Interdependencies in East Asian Security Competition: Reassessing the Role of Regional Actors and Europe

While many consider Sino-American relations in East Asia central to future great power competition, scholarly efforts to make sense of this competition remain incomplete. Much of the extant literature features several implicit assumptions: that conflict dynamics are driven by Sino-American competition, that competition is best understood by evaluating the economic and military realms, and that Soviet-American competition in Europe offers core lessons for this “new Cold War.” This panel foregrounds and problematizes these assumptions, including the central importance placed upon the US and China. Multiple papers consider the role of other actors, such as South Korea in shaping US-China competition in the nuclear realm (Seitz), the networked nature of competition between the EU, US, and China in digital development (Carver), and the role of Japan in a potential conflict over Taiwan (Ji and Matsuda).

This panel incorporates multiple theoretical and empirical perspectives to evaluate both new and enduring challenges for great power competition, with papers examining various dimensions of military and economic competition (Thorpe; Seitz; Ji & Matsuda) and less traditional forms of security assistance (Carver). Further, the papers highlight the importance of regionalism and periodization, (Thorpe; Seitz), and the contemporary role of networked interdependence (Carver), which reveals how drawing too heavily on European history, especially during the Cold War, might lead us astray in predicting and explaining competition in East Asia. Collectively, therefore, the panel demonstrates that much of this competition transcends East Asia and features in the behaviour of many great powers, including in Europe, rather than being the exclusive domain of Washington and Beijing.

Featuring an array of early career scholars from US, UK, and Japanese institutions, this panel advances scholarship on East Asian security, digital competition, and Europe’s role within it while also facilitating an intellectual dialogue between scholars working on East Asia, Africa, and Europe.

What discipline or branch of humanities or social sciences do you identify yourself with?

International Relations, Strategic Studies, History

If you are submitting an Open Panel proposal, have you included all four abstracts in attachment?

Yes, I have included all required information (see below).

Are you a PhD student or early-career researcher?

Yes

Primary authors: THORPE, Chelsea (University of Cambridge); CARVER, Julia (University of

Oxford); SEITZ, Samuel (University of Oxford)

Co-authors: JI, Elliot (Princeton University); MATSUDA, Takuya (University of Tokyo)

Presenters: THORPE, Chelsea (University of Cambridge); CARVER, Julia (University of Oxford); SEITZ, Samuel (University of Oxford); MATSUDA, Takuya (University of Tokyo)

Session Classification: Open Panel 1

Track Classification: Open Panels: Open Panel

Contribution ID: 227

Type: **Paper Abstract (Closed Panels)**

The Role of Narratives in Radicalisation: A Critical Examination of Causality and Agency

This study embarks on a comprehensive exploration of the intersection between narrative and terrorism, delving into the pivotal role narratives play in the radicalisation process. With a methodological approach grounded in an exhaustive literature review, employing keywords such as “narrative,” “terrorism,” and “radicalisation,” the study identifies three patterns of findings on this topic. The first category of researchers establishes a direct causal link between narratives and their impact on the opinions and behaviours of individuals, suggesting that stories can significantly influence audience actions. In contrast, the second category acknowledges the importance of narratives in radicalisation but refrains from asserting a straightforward causal relationship between narrative content and the commitment to violent actions. The third category casts doubt on the direct correlation between narratives and violent behaviours, positing that current academic discourse may overstate the influence of narratives, overlooking the critical element of individual agency. This investigation highlights the divergent scholarly perspectives on the role of narratives in radicalisation, revealing a common thread of scepticism towards the unequivocal power of narratives and underscoring the absence of rigorous, evidence-based studies. By examining the existing literature, the study seeks to address pressing questions surrounding the certainty of narrative influence on individual radicalisation and to define the narrative’s function more clearly within this complex process. The anticipated outcome is to contribute to a more nuanced understanding of the narrative dimension of terrorism, challenging the existing literature’s potential overemphasis on narrative power and advocating for a balanced consideration of audience agency.

What discipline or branch of humanities or social sciences do you identify yourself with?

Security Studies

If you are submitting an Open Panel proposal, have you included all four abstracts in attachment?

No, I am submitting a Closed Panel abstract

Are you a PhD student or early-career researcher?

Yes

Primary author: Ms RAHMAH, Unaesah (Leiden University)**Presenter:** Ms RAHMAH, Unaesah (Leiden University)**Session Classification:** Terrorism and Counter-Terrorism**Track Classification:** Closed Panels: Terrorism and Counter-Terrorism

Contribution ID: 228

Type: **Panel Proposal (Open Panels)**

Knowledge Production on War

The outbreak of a war on European territory in 2022 has rather suddenly created a high demand for expertise on war and strategy in Europe –a demand that has since been further fed by the war in Gaza, its impact on neighboring countries, as well as heightened tensions between the United States and China. At the same time, new technological developments, such as the reliance on AI or the cyber realm more generally, have increased demand for expert contributions to the public debate.

As expertise on war becomes more sought after and scholars become regular commentators and explainers of ongoing conflicts, deeper reflection on the underlying assumptions of this expertise often gets lost in the urgency to answer seemingly more pressing questions. It is, therefore, necessary to understand what this knowledge hides and highlights, and what/whose views, hierarchies and assumptions it reproduces.

The purpose of this panel is to investigate how knowledge on war is produced. It offers both long-term and macro-level studies of existing scholarship in Security and Strategic Studies as well as zooming in on the co-production of expertise by humans and technology in the domains of artificial intelligence and cyber. Leveraging historical, philosophical, psychological as well as political science approaches, each paper starts by fundamentally questioning what we know and how we know, to then highlight marginalized perspectives and open up avenues for further research. Whereas this panel primarily discusses knowledge production on war, its insights on how expertise is fundamentally shaped by how, where, by whom, and for what purposes it is produced also aim to stimulate and contribute to ontological and epistemological discussions within other panels. This panel brings together scholars from the humanities and social sciences from three different countries. Five of the six speakers are early-career scholars.

What discipline or branch of humanities or social sciences do you identify yourself with?

political science; history; psychology

If you are submitting an Open Panel proposal, have you included all four abstracts in attachment?

Yes, I have included all required information (see below).

Are you a PhD student or early-career researcher?

Yes

Primary authors: JANSEN, Alies (Leiden University); LIBISELLER, Chiara (Leiden University); LUDACKOVA, Dagmar (University of Defence, Czech Republic); DUUVESTEYN, Isabelle (Leiden University); CARVER, Julia (University of Oxford, United Kingdom); ZILINCIK, Samuel (University of Defence, Czech Republic)

Presenters: JANSEN, Alies (Leiden University); LIBISELLER, Chiara (Leiden University); LUDACKOVA, Dagmar (University of Defence, Czech Republic); DUYVESTYEN, Isabelle (Leiden University); CARVER, Julia (University of Oxford, United Kingdom); ZILINCIK, Samuel (University of Defence, Czech Republic)

Session Classification: Open Panel 2

Track Classification: Open Panels: Open Panel

Contribution ID: 230

Type: **Paper Abstract (Closed Panels)**

Technological Innovation and national security: Variations in public-private relations in the defense and cybersecurity sectors

In liberal market economies like the US and UK, private actors have come to play an indispensable role in the emergence of robust defense industries and the provision of security. States particularly rely on the private sector in areas of high technological innovation, such as arms production and cybersecurity. While technological innovation and the resulting public reliance on private expertise has been a common denominator, the emergence of public-private relations has been inconsistent across security sectors. Despite ideological parallels between the US and the UK, public-private relationships differ in the degree of consolidation or autonomy, and standardization of practices, between the state and private actors. In this study, we map these variations in the consolidation of relationships between public and private actors, attributing it to differences in institutional legacies and security pressures.

Through case studies on the US and the UK, we trace the evolution of public-private dynamics in two security sectors, defense industry and cybersecurity, since end of the Cold War. We find that more entrenched institutional legacies in the military industry have led to a closer, less market-oriented position of private actors and greater dependence on the state through contractual relationships. Conversely, less entrenched institutional legacies in the nascent cybersecurity sector have contributed to a more market-oriented, stronger position of private actors vis a vis the state, as evidenced by ongoing challenges in regulating the private tech industry. Furthermore, we find that the changing nature of security pressures in the cyberspace could push states towards a (re-)integration of this sector into more consolidated defense military pipelines. This paper contributes to the growing literature on public-private-partnerships in security governance and offers insight into the nexus of state security and technological innovation in two historically different, yet connected security policy fields.

What discipline or branch of humanities or social sciences do you identify yourself with?

Political Science

If you are submitting an Open Panel proposal, have you included all four abstracts in attachment?

No, I am submitting a Closed Panel abstract

Are you a PhD student or early-career researcher?

Yes

Primary authors: KODARU, Yagnyashri (GSI, LMU); Mr SOMMER, Lorenz (GSI, LMU)

Presenters: KODARU, Yagnyashri (GSI, LMU); Mr SOMMER, Lorenz (GSI, LMU)

Track Classification: Closed Panels: Political Economy, Technology and the Defence Industry

Contribution ID: 231

Type: **Paper Abstract (Closed Panels)**

Stigmatizing State Sponsors of Terrorism: An Evaluation of Feasibility

In the post-Cold War World, stigmatization emerged as a way of disciplining transgressive states. However, the existing state of affairs raises questions on the feasibility of targeted punishment and disciplining through stigmatization. Even the members of the Western liberal-democratic society of states sharing certain normative stances and similar security concerns do not always act in solidarity in creating an “audience of normals”, a group of states that come together to “stigmatize” -label, stereotype, separate and discriminate- a norm-breaking/deviant/transgressor actor, to put an end to its transgressive behavior. When they do, the stigmatization might not bear the targeted outcomes due to either the stigmatized actor’s stigma management or the stigma’s inadequate intensity. Adopting the theoretical insights revolving around the concept of stigma in international relations, this paper aims to explore at which instances a Western “audience of normals” was able to be mobilized to stigmatize states involved in terrorist activity. Three case studies from the Middle East and North Africa region, namely Iran, Libya, and Syria are selected to show the consensus and difference of approaches of the EU and the US in stigmatizing the terror-related activities of these actors. By doing this, the study will contribute to the theoretical debates on stigma imposition and discuss potential outcomes for international security.

What discipline or branch of humanities or social sciences do you identify yourself with?

International Relations, International Political Sociology, Middle East Studies

If you are submitting an Open Panel proposal, have you included all four abstracts in attachment?

No, I am submitting a Closed Panel abstract

Are you a PhD student or early-career researcher?

Yes

Primary author: Dr DINLER, Müberra (Charles University Faculty of Social Sciences, Institute of International Studies, PRCP)

Presenter: Dr DINLER, Müberra (Charles University Faculty of Social Sciences, Institute of International Studies, PRCP)

Session Classification: Terrorism and Counter-Terrorism

Track Classification: Closed Panels: Terrorism and Counter-Terrorism

Contribution ID: 234

Type: **Paper Abstract (Closed Panels)**

Wars of Imaginaries? Sino-American Strategic Competition and U.S. Practices of Loitering Munition Development

This paper brings recent advances in critical security studies and Science and Technology scholarship into greater dialogue with the more established International Relations (IR) literature on military change to highlight the role that shared social “imaginaries” of war can play in mediating how shifts in the external threat environment impact the development and fielding of new military technologies. This intervention helps address two shortcomings within existing IR accounts of military change: first, an inattention to the geopolitical animators of technological design practices within recent Critical Security Studies and Science and Technology scholarship; second, the calls for a more radical ‘critical turn’ in the study of military innovation that reaches beyond positivist explanatory models. Drawing from a range of primary and secondary sources, these insights are developed through a case-study analysis of the evolution of the U.S. Department of Defense’s practices of developing and fielding loitering munitions since its earliest experiments with these technologies during the 1970s. This analysis spans four different strategic contexts: (1) the (late) Cold War; (2) the ‘unipolar moment’ during the 1990s; (3) the Global War on Terror; and (4) the Trump administration’s institutionalisation of great power competition as the primary concern in U.S. national security. This paper argues that whilst the recent strategic focus on Sino-American strategic competition has impacted how loitering munitions are designed and what battlefield roles they are envisioned as having, these changes have been bounded within more durable shared “imaginaries” about how wars ought to and could be fought. In addition to extending the empirical study of loitering munitions as a key domain of Sino-American strategic competition, this paper thus makes a wider contribution to IR scholarship by highlighting the importance of further research into the social construction and implications of technological design practices.

What discipline or branch of humanities or social sciences do you identify yourself with?

IR

If you are submitting an Open Panel proposal, have you included all four abstracts in attachment?

Yes, I have included all required information (see below).

Are you a PhD student or early-career researcher?

No

Primary author: WATTS, Tom (Royal Holloway, University of London (Leverhulme Early Career Research Fellow))

Presenter: WATTS, Tom (Royal Holloway, University of London (Leverhulme Early Career Research Fellow))

Session Classification: Military Technology

Track Classification: Closed Panels: Military Technology

Contribution ID: 236

Type: **Paper Abstract (Closed Panels)**

Sino-Russian joint military exercises in focus: New strategic confluences in the Asia-Pacific

Thursday, 27 June 2024 11:40 (20 minutes)

This paper examines the current state of Sino-Russian strategic cooperation in the Asia-Pacific region through the lens of joint military exercises. Over the last two decades, China and Russia have conducted an increasing number of joint military exercises around the globe, both multilaterally and bilaterally. In 2012 the two countries launched their first joint naval exercise in the Yellow Sea, codenamed “Joint Sea-2012”. Since then, China and Russia have continued to develop their “Comprehensive Strategic Cooperation” and conducted a series of strategic air and naval patrols in the Asia-Pacific. Additionally, they have shown more willingness to take political risks, by increasing their military presence in sensitive sea lanes in the East China Sea, the Sea of Japan, and the Western Pacific. Drawing on existing academic literature on political and coercive signaling, this paper highlights the diplomatic-military dimension, as well as the significance of Sino-Russian exercises. By outlining emerging trends in the planning of bilateral exercises between China and Russia over the past decade, this paper shows how China is gradually shaping this cooperation to its advantage. Finally, this paper offers a reflection on the strategic risks and potential for escalation against the backdrop of territorial disputes and China’s military ambitions in the region.

What discipline or branch of humanities or social sciences do you identify yourself with?

Strategic studies / Political sciences

If you are submitting an Open Panel proposal, have you included all four abstracts in attachment?

No, I am submitting a Closed Panel abstract

Are you a PhD student or early-career researcher?

Yes

Primary author: GAPANY, Jerome (Military Academy (MILAC) at ETH Zurich)**Presenter:** GAPANY, Jerome (Military Academy (MILAC) at ETH Zurich)**Session Classification:** Defence Cooperation and Military Assistance**Track Classification:** Closed Panels: Defence Cooperation and Military Assistance

Contribution ID: 238

Type: **Paper Abstract (Closed Panels)**

Trapped in the Strategic Trilemma: Ukraine's role in the Black Sea region (2014-2024)

The Black Sea stands out as a region of heightened complexity due to the divergent military, economic, and legal interests among its littoral states. Faced with the challenge of pursuing discordant objectives, its states' policies towards this arena oftentimes appear incoherent. In this volatile geopolitical landscape, characterized by risks and intense competition, a nuanced understanding of the dynamics at play is imperative. We argue that the concept of the strategic "trilemma" best explains these dynamics. To demonstrate the heuristic utility of trilemmas for understanding Black Sea geopolitics, we examine in Ukraine's case in depth.

At its most basic, a strategic trilemma is a situation when a government pursues three distinct objectives, yet where only two can logically be achieved at the same time. For Ukraine, the three imperatives that Ukraine faces in the Black Sea include: 1) upholding/restoring national sovereignty over its 1991 borders; 2) deterring/defending against Russia, and 3) upholding a regional order favorable to Ukraine's economic development.

We demonstrate the utility of the strategic trilemma concept by examining how successive Ukrainian governments sought to reconcile these conflicting imperatives. We draw on various sources, to provide a detailed account of how Ukraine navigated sequential crises in the Black Sea, including Russia's seizure of Sevastopol and efforts through proxies to expand along the Sea of Azov, Russia's construction of the Azov Bridge and efforts to claim the Kerch Straits as "internal" wars.

Moreover, we suggest that the strategic trilemmas that littoral states face are a key factor complicating Ukrainian, Turkish, Romanian and Bulgarian efforts towards defence cooperation in the face of Russian revisionism. By understanding the trilemmas confronting Black Sea states, we can better conceptualize the forms of bilateral and multilateral cooperation that could roll back and contain Russia's efforts to dominate the Black Sea.

What discipline or branch of humanities or social sciences do you identify yourself with?

International Relations, War Studies, Security Studies, Regional Studies

If you are submitting an Open Panel proposal, have you included all four abstracts in attachment?

No, I am submitting a Closed Panel abstract

Are you a PhD student or early-career researcher?

No

Primary author: VDOVYCHENKO, Viktoriia (Cambridge University (from March 2024))

Co-author: Prof. DE VORE, Marc (St Andrews University)

Presenter: VDOVYCHENKO, Viktoriia (Cambridge University (from March 2024))

Session Classification: Defence Cooperation and Military Assistance

Track Classification: Closed Panels: Defence Cooperation and Military Assistance

Contribution ID: 244

Type: **Panel Proposal (Open Panels)**

Maritime security in the Indo-Pacific: perspectives from the EU

The European presence in the Indian Ocean and the wider Indo-Pacific has increased in the past years. Risks and threats to maritime security in key transit routes have grown in intensity, whether from piracy and terrorism, to the attacks by the Houthis on shipping in the Red Sea. At the same time, the concept of freedom of the seas is under attack in the Western Pacific, specifically the tensions in the South China Sea, the East China Sea, and the Taiwan Strait. European preferences for a free and open Indo-Pacific are clear, yet how these ends are best achieved is not. What are EU's privileged partners in the region? Through which formats (minilateral or EU-wide frameworks) can the EU act efficiently? Which issues are crucial for the EU and how many resources should be expended? This panel looks to answer these questions.

What discipline or branch of humanities or social sciences do you identify yourself with?

International Relations

If you are submitting an Open Panel proposal, have you included all four abstracts in attachment?

Yes, I have included all required information (see below).

Are you a PhD student or early-career researcher?

No

Primary authors: BLAREL, Nicolas (Leiden University); Dr VAN HOOFT, Paul (HCSS); Dr VAN WILLIGEN, Niels (Leiden University); Ms GIRARDI, Benedetta (HCSS); Dr PESJOVA, Eva (VUB); Dr PANDA, Jagannath (Institute for Security & Development Policy); Dr SWEIJS, Tim (HCSS); PALIWAL, Avinash (SOAS - University of London); Mr ELLISON, Davis (HCSS)

Presenters: BLAREL, Nicolas (Leiden University); Dr VAN HOOFT, Paul (HCSS); Dr VAN WILLIGEN, Niels (Leiden University); Ms GIRARDI, Benedetta (HCSS); Dr PESJOVA, Eva (VUB); Dr PANDA, Jagannath (Institute for Security & Development Policy); Dr SWEIJS, Tim (HCSS); PALIWAL, Avinash (SOAS - University of London); Mr ELLISON, Davis (HCSS)

Session Classification: Open Panel 3

Track Classification: Open Panels: Open Panel

Contribution ID: 245

Type: **Paper Abstract (Closed Panels)**

The Resilient Body of the State: Imaginary of Cohesive Society in PVE and Countering Hybrid Threats

This paper broadens the research on the international agenda of Countering/Preventing Violent Extremism by putting it into conversation with critical research on countering hybrid threats. While both international security agendas differ in their identification of the origins of the respective threats and specific countermeasures, they share the focus on security threats stemming from the interplay of actions of malign actors present inside the social body and domestic social failures. Drawing on the theoretical research on social imaginaries and critical research on resilience, the paper traces the imaginaries underpinning these international agendas and highlights the rising interest in societal divisions, polarisations, marginalisation, and alienation as a source of social vulnerabilities. Such imaginary foregrounds the idea of a cohesive society as a precondition for societal resilience and thus security, while pointing to threats stemming from groups that might not be properly attached to the state body and the rest of the society. Due to their marginalisation and alienation, these might be swayed by hostile propaganda or extremist recruiters and thus potentially present a security threat to the rest of society. In conclusion, the paper points out a novel social security imaginary foregrounding various societal failures as well as social cohesion as a precondition of societal resilience and thus security.

What discipline or branch of humanities or social sciences do you identify yourself with?

International Relations

If you are submitting an Open Panel proposal, have you included all four abstracts in attachment?

No, I am submitting a Closed Panel abstract

Are you a PhD student or early-career researcher?

No

Primary author: DANIEL, Jan

Presenter: DANIEL, Jan

Session Classification: Terrorism and Counter-Terrorism

Track Classification: Closed Panels: Terrorism and Counter-Terrorism

Contribution ID: 246

Type: **Paper Abstract (Closed Panels)**

Strengthening European Intelligence Cooperation: A New Interforce Intelligence Model to Overcome Trust Deficits and Cultural Barriers

This paper aims to outline the landscape of intelligence cooperation in Europe, highlighting a marked dependency on the United States - a situation clearly visible in the context of the Ukrainian war. This dependency emerges as a fundamental problem for European strategic autonomy. By analysing Jaffel Hager's contributions on Anglo-European intelligence cooperation, a framework is provided for understanding both the internal and external dynamics that influence intelligence sharing between the UK, Europe and, by extension, the US.

The evolution of intelligence cooperation explores through studies by Tuinier and Rietjens, uncovering a growing academic interest in the field despite its relative under-exploration.

A three-pillar approach suggests overcoming European dependence on the US for intelligence: Strengthening Europe's autonomous intelligence capabilities, Promoting a culture of trust and cooperation among member states and finally Integrating advanced technologies to improve intelligence collection and analysis.

The aim is to create a more cohesive European intelligence network, and certainly less dependent on external allies, so as to ensure its own independence and robustness.

To support the study, key academic works in the field of intelligence cooperation, such as Ben Jaffel Hager's 'Anglo-European Intelligence Cooperation: Britain in Europe, Europe in Britain', and articles from peer-reviewed journals such as the International Journal of Politics and Security will provide crucial insights into the dynamics and challenges of intelligence cooperation in Europe and beyond.

The research will adopt a mixed methodological approach, i.e. qualitative and quantitative techniques will be combined to ensure a comprehensive analysis using both primary and secondary sources.

What discipline or branch of humanities or social sciences do you identify yourself with?

Social Intelligence

If you are submitting an Open Panel proposal, have you included all four abstracts in attachment?

No, I am submitting a Closed Panel abstract

Are you a PhD student or early-career researcher?

Yes

Primary authors: Dr LISI, Claudio; EMPLER, Michele; Dr MADAIO, Raffaele

Presenter: Dr MADAIO, Raffaele

Session Classification: Intelligence

Track Classification: Closed Panels: Intelligence

Contribution ID: 247

Type: **Paper Abstract (Closed Panels)**

Navigating the Indo-Pacific: A Comparative Analysis of ASEAN and Quad Frameworks

Thursday, 27 June 2024 11:00 (20 minutes)

The Indo-Pacific region has experienced a notable surge in the establishment and consolidation of new multilateral and minilateral frameworks, largely driven by the shifting geopolitical landscape shaped by China's growing influence. Notably, the Quadrilateral Security Dialogue (Quad), consisting of Australia, India, Japan, and the United States, has advanced through intensive and regular cooperation to address pressing challenges in the region such as climate protection and health policy to maritime security. Concurrently, the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), a political and economic union representing 10 states in Southeast Asia, has progressively expanded its objectives to encompass the establishment of a shared security regime, in order to contrast political repression by member states, narcotics trafficking, and terrorism.

However, a noticeable research gap persists in the current literature regarding the ASEAN and Quad frameworks comparison. This paper aims to delve into the evolving dynamics within these two entities, meticulously scrutinizing the intricate interplay of differences, convergences, and emerging challenges within the evolving geopolitical landscape. The research will unfold in several key dimensions. Firstly, it will thoroughly examine the impact of changing geopolitical dynamics on joint military exercises, capacity-building efforts, and trainings for defense cooperation. Secondly, an in-depth analysis of existing charters and members' declarations will be conducted to illuminate the formal structures and commitments of both ASEAN and the Quad. Thirdly, the research will delve into the ASEAN-Quad bilateral relations with countries in the region—specifically South Korea, Mongolia, and Pakistan—providing a comprehensive understanding of the interconnectedness of these frameworks. Finally, the paper will undertake to examine and analyze the interactions between ASEAN and the Quad. This comparative approach will shed light on the distinct roles, contributions, and potential collaborations between the two frameworks, thereby contributing to a more nuanced understanding of defence cooperation dynamics in the Indo-Pacific region.

What discipline or branch of humanities or social sciences do you identify yourself with?

Security Studies

If you are submitting an Open Panel proposal, have you included all four abstracts in attachment?

No, I am submitting a Closed Panel abstract

Are you a PhD student or early-career researcher?

No

Primary author: PIOVESAN, Giorgia (University of Glasgow)

Presenter: PIOVESAN, Giorgia (University of Glasgow)

Session Classification: Defence Cooperation and Military Assistance

Track Classification: Closed Panels: Defence Cooperation and Military Assistance