The hour of populism

Since the euro crisis, the continent has been quarreling over the distribution of refugees – and the demagogues have a field day | By Peter H. Hofep and Lutz Litchenberger

The Munich Security Conference revealed the wide chasm between the West and Russia – or adapt to – these confrontations.
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The View from Russia: NATO exploited our weaknesses

The cold war ended with the collapse of communism in the Soviet Union and Central and Eastern Europe. Numerous European states and countries as well as countries in the former Soviet Union wanted to join the Western military alliance and its Eastern Partnership among Russia's neighbors. The countries of the former Soviet Union were in the process of adapting to a new world order. Russia's withdrawal from the Warsaw Pact and its new membership in the OSCE and the Council of Europe were important steps in this process.

Russia and the West have much in common: both have strong economies, large populations, and a history of military power. However, the West has been more successful in building a stable democracy, maintaining peace, and promoting economic growth. Russia, on the other hand, has struggled to overcome its historical legacy of autocracy and authoritarianism. The West has also been more successful in promoting human rights and democracy, while Russia has been more focused on its own interests.

The West's peace and prosperity are based on a system of alliances, institutions, and norms that have evolved over time. Russia sees these as threats to its security and sovereignty. The West believes that these alliances and institutions are necessary to maintain peace and stability. Russia's view of the world is often seen as parochial and narrow.

The West views Russia as a potential threat, while Russia views the West as an enemy. This is a result of the historical legacy of the cold war, which is still felt today. The West believes that Russia is a revisionist power, while Russia believes that the West is a hegemon.
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Renew dialogue, rebuild trust and restore security

Germany’s goals for its OSCE chairmanship
By Foreign Minister Frank-Walter Steinmeier

Without any doubt, there is still a long way ahead of us. Frequent violations of the ceasefire mean that every dose that is fired is still too many. At the same time, a constitutional reform for disarmament in Ukraine and the elaboration of a special status for the areas in eastern Ukraine remains decisive for a peaceful settlement of the conflict.

Russia’s annexation of Crimea and its interventions in Ukraine are a departure from the outlines of the Minsk Protocol – which was endorsed by a resolution of the Security Council. There is still a long way to go, and none of the steps ahead will be easy – the recent escalation between Moscow and Kiev must not be allowed to derail. Our task is that of a bridge builder, to reconnect regional actors needed for a more peaceful future.

It is in this context that Germany actively contributes to conflict resolutions, be it in the context of the EU or the Vienna talks on Syria. Germany wants to be a facilitator, enabling dialogue and supporting negotiation processes.

The OSCE works for stability, peace and democracy for more than a billion people, through political dialogue about shared values and practical work that makes a lasting difference.

osce.org

The bleakest possible picture

on where she can still rely is shrinking fast. The world is leaving the German chancellor on her own – and her words mean less to those who talk of tectonic shifts.

Energy was just one of the many topics that dominated the meeting of leaders in Berlin on Tuesday. Venezuela, the Ukrainian crisis, Middle East, terrorism and the refugee crisis dominated the talks.

By Foreign Minister Frank-Walter Steinmeier
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Munich talks

World leaders gathered at the MSC. Here’s what they had to say:

King Abdullah II bin Al Hussein of Jordan: “We, as Arabs and Muslims, have a responsibility and duty to be in the lead in the fight against the Khawarej, Arabs and Muslims, have a responsibility and duty to be in the lead in the fight against the Khawarej.

NATO Secretary-General Jens Stoltenberg: “NATO does not seek confrontation. We do not have the power to do it. We need to work together. We have enough inclusive development. We need to work together.

French Prime Minister Manuel Valls: “We have entered a new era, characterized by a durable presence of hyperterrorism. We need to work together. We have enough inclusive development.

Geraint Thomas executive editor That’s because as to whether there is danger of war in the Balkans, Dačić responded: “Mr. Putin, this is not a civil war in Ukraine, this is your aggression.”

President of the European Parliament Martin Schulz: “Desolidarization is the biggest crisis in the EU. We need to work together. We have enough inclusive development.

German Foreign Minister Frank-Walter Steinmeier: “Y ou cannot have peace without security, and you cannot have security without peace.

Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov: “Mr. Putin, this is not a civil war in Ukraine, this is your aggression.”

Lithuanian President Dalia Grybauskaite: “Mr. Putin, this is not a civil war in Ukraine, this is your aggression.”

Giesecq & Devrient

Big decisions need strong security.

Wherever important decisions are made, data safety becomes just as important. Giesecq & Devrient and secunet is your team for this task. Together, we ensure governments can safely exchange critical data. And secrets stay secrets.
8 February 2016

The best defense against extremism is unity

Jens Stoltenberg: The best defense against extremism is unity

Todays, we are facing unique challenges in our security than we have experienced for a generation,” and NATO Secretary General Jens Stoltenberg (pic.) in an article for Newsweek in the last January calls out Russia for “actively encouraging Crimea,” marking it “the first European country to take part of another by force since World War II.” Russia has now reasserted itself in the wake of the West’s weakened credibility in its deterrence structure. The key to European defense and being open to safe. There is no contradiction between being a strong defense and being open to dialogue. Doing strong means being more able to engage in dialogue with countries such as Russia.”

The NATO Secretary General counters that NATO is to be the locomotive of the fight against international terrorism. The U.S. has already taken the lead in the fight against terrorism, and NATO should also support the U.S. in the fight against terrorism. The U.S. has already supported the NATO operation in Afghanistan. The U.S. has already taken the lead in the fight against terrorism. The U.S. has already supported the NATO operation in Afghanistan.

In today’s world, both diplomacy and compartmentalization and cooperation are the order of the day. By Theodor Sommer

Doing the possible

In today’s world, both diplomacy and compartmentalization and cooperation are the order of the day. By Theodor Sommer

International politics has become a “Grosario” world with no shared values, standards or principles (the Grosario). Global hegemony is no longer possible. While Washington will remain the world’s leader for a long time, it is no longer the unchallenged world power. The self-proclaimed Islamic State (IS) is imposing its writ on Mesopotamia. Saudi Arabia and Iran are engaged in intense proxy conflicts. The world is divided into three main blocs: the U.S. and its allies, China and Russia, and the rest of the world. The world is divided into three main blocs: the U.S. and its allies, China and Russia, and the rest of the world.
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**Russia’s Syria gambit**

**Putin’s overruling goal in the Levant is not defending terrorism, but elevating Russia’s place in the world order**

By Dmitry Trenin

Two plans months into Putin’s military operation in Syria make little headway. One seeks to impose a complete ceasefire, the other pressures all parties to meet its provisions. On this basis, Moscow and its nominal ally, Bashar Al-Assad, avert the threat of additional military engagement, with the West must take into account the broader implications of Moscow’s use of military force against Syria. While the likelihood of Russian military action against the West seems low, it cannot be ruled out. Moscow’s aggressive actions in Syria demonstrate its willingness to act unilaterally to achieve its foreign policy goals. The West must work to prevent Moscow from achieving its strategic objectives in Syria and to limit its influence in the region. The key to settling the conflict continues to lie in Moscow, which has demonstrated the need for a change in the international order. Western policy should aim to change the calculus of costs and benefits for Moscow and its partners. This requires a successful completion of the Minsk II provisions, all of which must be implemented. Additional military assistance should be provided to bolster Ukraine’s resilience. In addition, additional military engagement should be avoided at all costs. The West should work to prevent Moscow from achieving its strategic objectives in Syria and to limit its influence in the region.
NATO’s next strategic adaptation

The alliance must improve military readiness, reinforce its collective defense posture and accelerate decision-making | By James Hackett

The use of military force to resolve historical boundary disputes in Europe’s bickering was a stark reminder to NATO that relations with Russia and deci-
sion-makers in Berlin and Washington began to shift in response to Moscow’s aggression in 2014. In 2015, the Summit and the availability of the response was increased at NATO’s Warsaw Summit this year.

It was no surprise that Russia’s actions in 2014 – annexing Crimea and supporting separatists in eastern Ukraine – caused considerable concern in NATO capitals, particularly in its eastern member states. As tensions rose in the wake of the official and informal meetings of the European security and defense leaders in Brussels in early May, NATO副秘书长 to the secretary of the Defense Cooperation (ECS) and NATO Strategic Communication (NATO) was the first to recognize the Steps arrangements in Brussels and the steps taken by NATO to enhance the NATO Response Force (NRF) and the VJTF (Violet Banner) during the deployment of these forces. 

As NATO’s Secretary General, the role of the Secretary General is to ensure that the alliance’s response is effective and consistent with the principles of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the values of democracy, freedom, and the rule of law. NATO is a cooperative alliance of 30 member states from North America and Europe, committed to collective defense and security.

However, maintaining the alliance’s response in the face of new threats has been challenging. The military assurance and cooperation of the United States, the European Union, and other NATO member states have been crucial in maintaining the alliance’s capabilities in the face of new threats.

The military assurance and cooperation of the United States, the European Union, and other NATO member states have been crucial in maintaining the alliance’s capabilities in the face of new threats.
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Refugees, Syria, Russia, terrorism and EU problem-solving capacity have merged into one crisis landscape. By Volker Perthes

T
two years into Germany’s “new foreign policy”

By Bernd von Peiser

On the sidelines

no more

Policymakers in Berlin are aware that these European and international partners expect the new level of international cooperation – including forward-looking measures such as change in military culture or counterterrorism support – to be broad and not just an add-on to the existing cooperation. Berlin also knows that the integration of EU and international partners is necessary for the success of any German policy. By far, it is not an accident that the policy of re-emerging powers, notably China and multilateral decision-making countries. The stream of refugees also continues.

Refugees, Syria, Russia, terrorism and EU problem-solving capacity have merged into one crisis landscape. By Volker Perthes

Overly optimistic?

The new Syria peace process is now underway but it has even begun
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Standoff in the Gulf

Saudi Arabia and Iran: an escalating struggle for hegemony

The conflict between Saudi Arabia and Iran is more than a decade old. It began with Iran’s nuclear program, which Saudi Arabia considers a threat to its security. The dispute has since expanded to include regional tensions, with each country seeking to assert its influence over the other’s spheres of influence. Iran’s backing of the Shia Houthi rebels in Yemen and its support for Hezbollah in Lebanon have been major sticking points. Both countries have sought to undermine each other’s influence in the region, leading to a series of proxy wars and conflicts. The situation is further complicated by the involvement of other regional actors, including Russia, the US, and others. The conflict has also spilled over into the political and economic spheres, with Iran and Saudi Arabia both seeking to exert influence over the oil market and regional economies. The standoff has been characterized by cycles of tension and de-escalation, with both sides occasionally seeking to find a way out of the impasse. The situation remains volatile, with the potential for further flare-ups and confrontation. 

February 2016

Steadfast in the Gulf By Thomas Avenarius

Though the topic is the Middle East, it is not the usual Middle East, at least not as we know it. The region is, if not divided into different countries, at least divided into different political entities, each with its own borders, governments, and commercial community. No one can afford the luxury of defining Saudi Arabia as an economic entity, even if it has a large enough economy to be a significant player in the global economy. The region is not without its own internal tensions and conflicts, and the Saudi-Iranian conflict is one of them.

Iran’s nuclear program, which it denies is of a military nature, is a major source of tension between the two countries. The program has been a source of concern for Saudi Arabia and the United States, who see it as a threat to regional stability. The US has imposed sanctions on Iran, which has led to a deterioration of relations between the two countries. The crisis has also been exacerbated by the political situation in Iran, with the country’s leaders facing domestic and international pressure.

Saudi Arabia and Iran are also engaged in a struggle for influence in the Gulf region, with both countries seeking to assert their influence over the countries in the region. The conflict has been characterized by cycles of tension and de-escalation, with both sides occasionally seeking to find a way out of the impasse. The situation remains volatile, with the potential for further flare-ups and confrontation.

February 2016

Turbulence

Erdogan’s recklessness has jeopardized his country’s future

By Michael Thumann

Turkey’s president is known for his erratic behavior. He has often been a source of controversy, and his actions have often been a cause for concern. Erdogan has been accused of bringing democracy in Turkey to a standstill, and his government has been criticized for its human rights record and its treatment of political opponents. Erdogan has also been accused of using his powers to silence critics and opposition voices, and his government has been criticized for its authoritarian tendencies. The president has been known to use his powers to suppress dissent and to stifle criticism, and his government has been accused of using its resources to promote a particular political agenda.

In recent years, Erdogan has been widely criticized for his aggressive foreign policy. He has been accused of using his country’s military to support regimes in the Middle East and North Africa, and his government has been criticized for its role in the ongoing conflict in Syria. Erdogan has been accused of arming and funding rebel forces in Syria, and his government has been criticized for its role in the ongoing conflict in Syria. Erdogan has also been accused of using his government’s power to stifle criticism of his government’s policies and to suppress dissent.
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Kurds vs. Kurds

Rivalry between the Syrian arm of the PKK and the Kurdish autonomous government in Erbil is undermining the fight against IS | By Markus Bickel

The Kurds have been fighting on both sides of Syria and Iraq since last year’s invasion of the territory. Chances of a military victory are slim. Speaking recently in his home party meeting, members of the movement against IS in Syria and Iraq have been discussing how best to fight IS. The Kurds have been in conflict with IS for years, mainly in Syria. Now the head of the PKK, the Kurdistan Worker’s Party (PKK), has been fighting IS on the southern border of Turkey. The PKK has been trying to drive a wedge between IS and Turkey’s Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL). The PKK also supports the Syrian regime and its allies. The conflict between the PKK and IS has been going on for months. The PKK has been supporting the Kurdish forces in Iraq and Syria against IS. The PKK has been fighting IS on the northern border of Turkey and the southern border of Syria. The PKK has been supported by the Syrian government and its allies, including Russia and Iran.
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The security dimension of the climate change debate... || By Dan Smith

The Internet has grown dramatically, connecting billions of devices and people around the world and creating millions of jobs.

There is no single, best way to address climate change. The problem is complex and requires a multi-faceted approach. Here are some key strategies that can help:

1. Reduce greenhouse gas emissions: This is the most important step to take in order to combat climate change. We need to reduce our reliance on fossil fuels and shift to renewable energy sources.
2. Increase energy efficiency: By improving the efficiency of energy use, we can reduce the amount of energy that is needed to perform a given task.
3. Plant more trees: Trees absorb CO2 from the atmosphere and help to reduce the amount of greenhouse gases in the air.
4. Use public transportation: Cars and other vehicles contribute significantly to greenhouse gas emissions. By using public transportation, we can reduce our carbon footprint.
5. Promote sustainable agriculture: Agriculture is responsible for a significant portion of greenhouse gas emissions. By promoting sustainable agriculture practices, we can reduce these emissions.

We need to work together to address climate change and protect our planet for future generations.
INVENTOR OF CRUISES SINCE 1891

When HAPAG director Albert Ballin put to sea in 1891 with the Augusta Victoria, he invented a completely new form of travel: the cruise. This pioneering spirit characterises us to this day. It’s how we were able to reinvent the cruise in 2013 - with the MS EUROPA 2 recognised as the best ship in its class. 125 years of cruises – become a part of the history: www.since-1891.com/times