

Doctoral School of Military Sciences
National University of Public Service

Booklet of Thesis Statements and Summary

According to “Admission for Doctoral (PhD) Studies”, ZRINYI MIKLÓS Defence University, §43 (9)

**Relations between Functional Principles of Democracies and
Their Armed Forces**

Subtitle:

*An Analysis of Relevant Influencing Factors and Their Systemic
Interdependence*

Candidate

Brigadier MMag. Wolfgang PEISCHEL

Supervisor

Dr. habil. Andràs UJJ, CSc

Vienna, July 2014

Herewith, I declare that the presented thesis with the topic “Relations between Functional Principles of Democracies and Their Armed Forces” was not presented to an other institution, and was not rejected by any other one.

Vienna, July 9th, 2014

(Bgdr MMag. Wolfgang Peischel)

(c) Formulation of the Academic Problem

The academic problem can be defined by the following mutually dependent sub-problems:

1. Western, post-modern democracies, in peace-time unknowingly jeopardize internal democratic stability by reducing and withdrawing armed forces from the public view. Additional research should create the requested awareness.
2. A down-grading of armed forces without consideration of the systemic interrelation between democratic principles of the state and military functional principles, endangers the internal democratic stability of the state. Therefore a scientific analysis of the above mentioned relationship is indispensably needed. It will have to be distinguished between wars of democracies among each other and wars of democracies against less democratic systems¹.
3. The relationship between democracy and peace is undervalued. The research is to sensitize for the importance of this relation.
4. Categorization-contexts for democratic principles of the state and for the military functional principles, as well as the different integration-frameworks are not recognized. The structured analysis-model will have to define such frameworks, as precondition for system-compatible changes.
5. Even where the importance of armed forces for internal democratic stability is recognized, political leadership - due to missing knowledge of the above deduced systemic interrelations – will only access symptomatic changes. The main purpose of the analysis-model is advice to political leadership and force planners how to achieve systemic changes towards democracy-compatible, and at the same time, mission-effective armed forces.
6. The mutual dependency of internal democratic stability and external security is not sufficiently recognized, whereby primarily Western national strategies might be doomed to fail. The analysis will have to prove the democracy-relevance of this interrelation and to include it into the systemic interdependency-network.
7. The antagonism between the need for the identification of a state's strategic targets and the ongoing decline of values, results in the problem to explain the need for armed forces in peacetime or to keep them long-term mission-effective and at the same time democracy-compatible. The research will have to suggest a synthesis, combining both requests and an argumentation, which supports the acceptance of the logic that particularly contributions to the state's defense are a major precondition for a participation in the political decision-making.

¹ The finding that democracies are more peace-loving by trend, results from a one-sided interpretation. In fact democracies are engaged in wars *against less democratic systems*, as often as other political regimes. It is only the probability of wars *between democratic systems* that is significantly lower.

(d) Research Goals

The following research-targets and sub-targets had been defined:

1. *The main target lies on the attempt to raise the sensibility* of political decision-makers and military force-planners, for the importance of mission-effective and at the same time democracy-compatible armed forces and their decisive impact on the long-term and peaceful democratic survival of the state. Above that, the main target includes the creation of understanding for the finding that the factors that are constitutive for the survival of the democratic social order, interact as elements of an organic system – and therefore only should be altered when all consequences of reorganizations of the *entire* system are reviewed and assessed.
2. One research-target was to transform the analyzed functional principles of the above system into policy-advice, to find core-elements to improve the current handling of security issues and to answer how such can support both, political leadership and military force planning.
3. As shrinking defense-budgets will not allow to cope reliably with foreseeable future challenges, the research is to provide a tool to recognize deviations/deficiencies from the current security situation just in time to countersteer negative developments prophylactically.
4. Personal insight for the demand is to be created that higher military leadership-levels are to be enabled to provide policy recommendations, based on strategic target-identification- and assessment-expertise. A profile of a new discipline of “leadership-science” for complex, time-critical, unpredictable situations is to be defined, as the intellectual basis for the attainment and enhancement of the above strategic assessment expertise.
5. In the same way, it will have to be sensitized for the importance of training, education and character-building as means to counteract an uncontrolled and negative development towards a post-modern values-order that results in a loss of military capabilities.
6. Sensitivity of political leadership will also have to be raised concerning the finding that the broad scope of role-profiles of 21st century armed², is to be perceived as the imperative precondition for the long-term democratic survival of the state.
7. Furthermore, consciousness must be enhanced concerning
 - the commitment of citizens to national defense, as the precondition of the fortified democracy, and later on to an European defense establishment,

² This role-profile includes defense to the outside as well as simultaneous contributions to internal democratic stability.

- the role of armed forces to safeguard the democratic values-order already during peace-time,
- the correct valuation of the interdependence of peace and democracy, and
- the requirement of a simultaneous linkage between internal democratic stability and external security.

The clearly defined “**non-targets**” of the research, would be to include any judgment of political decisions or to criticize or explain the reasons of shrinking budgets (which would require a macro-economic analysis of a number of European states). It much rather will be aimed at making the consequences of taken measures or of such that had not been taken, plausible, and to explain the respective risks that result from steering-inputs, whereby a reasonable prioritization will be suggested that allows to optimize military effectiveness even despite limited resources.

The analysis merely shows options including the respective risks, quantifies the risk-content of each option and *deduces an according prioritization*. This prioritization manifests itself in the distinction between driving- and dependent-factors, and in the suggested critical path for possible reorganizations. Which option governments choose, which risks they take and which priorities they actually set, may not be judged nor criticized – as political leadership has the sole and final responsibility for any chosen defense-policy (including having none at all), and because it is legitimated by the democratic will of the people and thus by the constitutional principle of the primacy of politics.

(e) Research Methods

The envisaged goal, namely to arrive at a systemic interrelation within a wide and multidimensional range of democracy-relevant factors, functional principles and phenomena, compellingly led to a broad spectrum of theories and methods that should allow to deal with each of these facets, by handling them with the “tools” they require. Therefore, a particularly strong emphasis had to be given to the design and composition of the theory-/method-set to be applied here.

Research-results that deal with the mutual influence of democratic principles and armed forces from a comprehensive and systemic view are scarcely existing yet and there is only a limited amount of *literature* tackling this topic. *Experiments* respectively an *empiric reasoning* of findings inherently seems problematic, as soon as national security is at stake. Therefore the following guiding principles for the scientific-theoretical approach of the research had to be chosen:

- Functional principles that explain the systemic interrelations to be researched here, had to be constructed in a mainly **rational** approach.

- Subsequently, relevant, observed and observable phenomena had to be selected, abstracted and generalized on the basis of military scientific- respectively military leadership-related experience, in an **inductive** way.
- The findings, resulting from the above phenomena were supposed to lead to a **nomothetic** outcome – that additionally was expected to support the functional principles that had been rationally defined before.
- The subsequent breaking down of identified functional principles for an advice for the political leadership, like how to control the “network” of democracy-relevant factors systemically, represents the **deductive** part of the research.

Besides the **International Relation Theory-related methods** also further singular-sciences/-disciplines-related methods had been applied. The latter mainly belong to **qualitative research within the humanities**. It is just the variety and diversity of phenomena of military leadership that called for the multifaceted method-set, offered by qualitative research.

The thesis explains the complex system of the mutual interdependencies between democratic and military functional principles, in order to recommend “control measures” by which armed forces can be made mission-effective and democracy-compatible at the same time. This requested a “working backwards”-analysis of phenomena and an in-depth understanding of the underlying functional principles to be able to predict possible coming challenges. Only when their function is well understood, mutual interdependencies can be achieved and deduced. To watch and describe a phenomenon only from one specific perspective falls short. It has to be understood where a functional principle’s virtual origin lies, how it gets effective, why it works as it works, and how it has developed, respectively is likely to develop in the future. This demand called **for a hermeneutical approach** in combination with the **literature/context-analysis**. This combination was the guiding method of the research, regarding the specific development of hermeneutical methods into the direction of the **critical-hermeneutical**, respectively the **grammatical-psychological** interpretation, especially in the Clausewitzian understanding.

The hermeneutic approach was substantially facilitated by **comparative** elements that follow the idea of the inter-system-comparison, which is frequently used in case-studies. Comparative methods were particularly useful when it came to the analysis of cultural-area-studies or of national specifics of military leadership (like comparing Anglo-American and continental European leadership-philosophies).

The literature/context-analysis that was used as the basis, upon which the hermeneutical approach of the research built, includes primary documentary (e.g. strategic concepts, strategy papers, doctrines, political strategies of global key players thereby emphasizing Europe and the US, military-strategic concepts, white books) as well as secondary literature and its analyses. Concepts mirror the will of political key-players, their estimates and decisions, their visions, strategic goals and projections more authentically. Logically was one main focus throughout the research laid on such concepts.

Publications dealing with the interrelation between democratic and military functional principles are hardly to find – even less any literature that is committed to the systemic network, which results from the mutual interdependence between recognized interrelations. Therefore the emphasis did not lie in citations of existing literature, nor was the topic suitable for an experimental probation of its theses. The intention rather was to analyze strategic concepts, as far as they are the documented will to attain a certain goal, subsequently to *context-analytically* interpret and *hermeneutically* understand the underlying, interwoven conditions that have led to the formulation of the concepts, to independently derive systemic functional principles that can then be related to each other and eventually to transpose those findings that are supposed to have a sufficient general validity, into advice to political decision makers, by using *deductive methods*.

Heuristic methods were insofar only *specifically* used because it was *not* the objective of the research to make many statements about the dependencies of the various factors of a political system with limited knowledge of this system itself (like it was in the past) and then to probe these statements empirically. The goal was rather to discover dependencies with rational-nomothetic methods, because the reliability of the deduced dependencies should be the core performance of the research. **Heuristics** were therefore only used where a principal dependence of factors could be logically and compellingly derived - however, in many cases could not be quantified sufficiently.

Legal sciences as well as the methods used by them play an outstanding role among the singular disciplines. The corresponding method-set comprises two fundamentally differing aspects - the natural law- and the positive law-approach, which can be seen as two sides of the same medal. In cases where legal science is challenged to define precise Rules of Engagement that don't leave commanders in the field alone with the requirement to "interpret" in time-critical situations, whether the use of force is legitimate or not, to design treaties and contracts between subjects to International Law or to formulate respectively alter democratic freedom-related articles of the states' constitutions – the **positive law-related approach** was predominantly used.

Where a weighing of circumstances was required about how much restriction to democratic freedoms may be put up with for the superior goal of national security/-interest, and where the responsibility of commanders demanded, to disobey orders like ones that are contradicting human rights or fundamental moral standards, the **natural law-related approach** was to be chosen. Where the “auxiliary construction” of Customary International Law and the assertion of “*opinio iuris*” must be used in order to save people that helplessly are exposed to life-threatening violence, because a politically agreed Security Council mandate is missing, there also had the natural-law-approach to be applied.

(f) Description of the Examination Carried Out Chapter by Chapter;

By the representation of the Research Structure, the logical path through the work will be described. It is mainly planned to serve the orientation of potential users (to some extent as an “operating instruction”), who want to apply the structured model, after having adapted it to their national needs. These users shall be enabled to trace the analysis-process of this study, thereby to tailor the structured model to their specific national conditions, and eventually to arrive at the appropriate conclusions for their respective armed forces-development.

The “**Research Design**” begins with the section “**Research Framework**”, which roughly outlines the state of the European security policy development in its core parameters (like guiding political rationale, important predictable/expectable short- and medium-term trends). Subsequently, a basic overview will be given that is supposed to show in which security-political environment, in which current aggregate state of which trend, the research-questions will have to be processed.

At the beginning of the section “**Academic Problem, Hypothesis**” initially those issues are identified, to the solution of which, the research can provide a scientific contribution. The hypothesis, which is oriented towards answering the identified problems, is constructed around the core-assumption that a peaceful long term survival of the democratic state can only be achieved by armed forces of a capability-profile as already described in sub-chapter “*Deduction and structuring of the Core-Hypothesis and Sub-Theses*”, which in turn depends on the key factor of a broad humanistic general education.

In order to eventually operationalize the results of the research, the hypothesis will include the assumption that, by the development of a structured analysis-model, the systemic interrelations between democratic functional principles of the state, and operational principles/phenomena/factors of military leadership, and thus the basics for their evaluation, will be explained.

The “**Research Questions**”, derived from the hypothesis, are to be understood as the tools for its systematic analysis. They also reflect the problems that have led to the definition of the hypothesis.

In chapter “**Methods**”, both the individual methods and selected combinations of methods, relevant for the analysis-part, and their specific application to the respective processing steps will be explained, as well as the methodological basis for the systemic, structured analysis model.

It must again be noted that the structured model is part of the added value, and thus rather a "product" of the research than just a method for its creation. Therefore, and because the recommendation regarding the choice of suitable methods for user-specific application, will also be part of the systemic structured model, it had to be explained, why one specific method had been selected in the present study whereas another had to be discarded. Thus, decision-makers are given alternative approaches and decision-process basics among which they can choose their individual method-sets that they need as soon as they start to adjust the structured model to their specific initial conditions.

The section “**Research Structure**” represents a "critical path" throughout the work, which is supposed to make the logical dependence of the steps among each other traceable.

The core of the “**Research Targets**” of the thesis lies with the approach to construct a systemic interdependency-network among democracy-relevant influencing factors – which requests to comprehend the entity of the latter, as an organic body. By creating a system-perspective over the effect correlations, will also be tried to make a contribution to curbing the lack of strategic thinking in the field of conceptual foundations of Force Development. By demonstrating the central role of training, character-building and education, an antidote shall be defined to an uncontrolled postmodern values-development within the armed forces, by the help of which, the threat of military capability losses can be countered effectively.

The “**Envisaged Added Value**” of the thesis is represented by the offered analysis-model and centers on answering the question how the user himself can determine and adapt the system of effect-correlations between democracy principles of the state and democracy relevant military functional principles, according to his individual conditions and how he can apply the results as a basis for appropriate steering measures.

The main objective of the structured model is that the user (like the respective state), recognizes the system of effect-correlations and acquires the capability to apply this model in a way that it yields a holistical, reality shaping success, which means not only a symptomatic treatment of problems; it should bring guidance to many debated essential questions and must avoid to achieve only a seeming partial success that causes more significant adverse effects in other areas. That application

of the structured model also would include contributions to the political level, which makes the final decision in budget allocation, capabilities- and force planning.

The **analysis-part (“Structured Analysis Model”)** of the work is introduced by an elaboration on the question of the role of armed forces as an instrument, a symbol respectively as the ultimate manifestation of democratic states' sovereignty. Thus, the fundamental relationship between democratic states and their armed forces shall be derived from its historical roots and explained in its essence, in order to conclude therefrom on a contemporary valid set of expectations in the military.

Subsequently a method is offered (**“Assessment of the Respective User’s Initial Situation”**), which helps the user of the model to find and “calibrate” the respective initial situation from which the model-supported evaluation can start. This method includes a first overview of the criteria according to which a categorization of democratic principles can be deduced and an explanation, why democratic functional principles have such a significant constitutive value for the security-political paradigm of the Western community.

Sub-chapter “Armed Forces and the Sovereignty of the State” elaborates on the development of the Security Policy-paradigm of the Western State Community, deduces factors complexes that influence and determine the specific relation between the state and its armed forces and creates “test-questions” by which this relation can be measured.

The above step requires a broad theoretical basis in order to make the principles behind the test-questions (a) understandable and (b) applicable regardless of specific national conditions. Sub-chapter **“Theoretical Framework to be Used as Toolset for the Respective National Analysis”** therefore gives an explanation on the necessity of a thorough analysis of the theoretical framework, in which the research is to be embedded, and that is designed to serve as a toolset for the respective national analysis.

Because the entire theory-part turned out to be very voluminous (as there had more approaches to be offered than would be needed within one specific assessment) it had been shifted to **Annex 2 “Extended Theoretical Framework to be Used as Toolset for the Respective National Analysis”**.

Following to the representation of the analysis model as a whole, the structured analysis-interface, as the latter’s operational/executive element is explained. In the section that deals with the **“Structured Analysis-interface”** shall first the basic nature and effect of the analysis-tool be explained and a guide for the user-specific application be given. This *structured model* will, in the

figurative sense, become a *portion of the hypothesis* – the systemic analysis of functional principles, conducted with the help of the model, *part of its corroboration*.

Subsequently, it is shown, which basic, **security relevant functional principles of western democratic-pluralistic states** can be identified, and how they *project on* respectively how they *fit into* the defined system-categories.

As the counterpart to the democratic functional principles of the state, **democracy relevant functional principles/phenomena/factors of military leadership** are tackled with particular emphasis on the ethical dimension of military leadership respectively the overall soldierly ethos in the democratic political system.

Both strands, democratic principles of the state and those with military implication, were transformed from their primordial order-logic into an “interface-appropriate” one, by the help of the deduced categorization dimensions, “participation”, “internal functional capability of armed forces” and “mission-effectiveness”.

As a third step, “**Categorization-dimensions**” are defined by which democratic functional principles and principles/phenomena/factors of military leadership are to be intersected for the purpose of the analysis of their mutual interdependencies.

The rationale of the analysis model as a whole lies with a twofold approach: Firstly to provide the instrument by which the research will be enabled to deduce systemic interdependencies between functional principles of the military and those of the democratic state, secondly to offer a scheme by retracing of which, the user of the model can conduct the respective individual evaluation according to his specific framework-conditions.

The model deliberately avoids to offer an “instruction manual” on how to reorganize armed forces. Its basic function lay much rather with suggesting fundamental principles and analysis-methods that are to enable the respective user to an independent assessment.

The “**Analysis of Selected, Significant, Democracy Relevant Functional Principles/Phenomena/Factors of Military Leadership**” is conducted against the backdrop of the above defined categorization-dimensions. The resulting dependencies between the democracy-related military functional principles are additionally visualized by relational-arrows within the mind-map, in which these principles are depicted.

The “**Analysis of Selected Democracy Relevant Functional Principles/Phenomena/Factors of Military Leadership**” is conducted under exemplary application of the structured analysis-model. This analysis-section focuses on the German language area, in particular on the Austrian perception

of the selected principles. This Austrian perception is characterized by the specific composition of elements of history of thought, enlightenment, humanistic general education for military officers, military-scientific methodology, military history, military humanities and social sciences as well as by a human-oriented understanding of leadership and a distinct consciousness of the mission-type leadership-principle.

The analysis is to show how the selected principles can be investigated by applying the proposed structured analysis-model. Furthermore is the user to be enabled, to retrace the evaluation-procedure with his individual parameters, and against the backdrop of the respective, national security-political situation.

In the course of the sub-chapter “Thinking about War” it is analyzed, how theory of war (in particular the Clausewitzian thinking) influences the democratic quality, respectively democracy-compatibility of armed forces. Above that, the Clausewitzian military-scientific methodology is investigated with regard to its function as a fundament for modern strategic goal-setting, operational leadership-processes and for the development of a new academic discipline “leadership science” that has to grow up from military-science. The analysis of the “Third Clausewitzian Pillar” aims at the creation of awareness for the importance of a moral-ethical corrective for the recognition of unlawful orders. It could be substantiated that this corrective, which mainly depends on humanistic general education, represents the indispensable precondition for the perpetuated prevalence of primacy of politics and thus the core-principle of democracy-compatibility of armed forces.

The analysis of the principle of “**Leadership-Philosophy**” focuses on the democracy-supportive effect of mission-oriented leadership that rather aims at the military leaders’ capability of self-dependent evaluation in a given situation than on a pragmatic, mechanistic operating instruction for different predefined, combat-situations. Subsequently are the functional principles of mission-oriented leadership deduced as well as the factors that represent its preconditions. The main finding lay with the two paths, along which mission-oriented leadership unfolds its **democracy-relevant effect**: Firstly via focusing on substantive, pragmatic approaches to achieve mission-effectiveness, which enable armed forces to act as a reliable tool for the preservation/projection of democracy, secondly via a social dimension that mirrors the democratic participation-principle towards the state, within the unit, and that is primarily to be understood as a principle of the internal peace-time functioning of military forces.

The research leads to the conclusion that the necessary synthesis between mission-type- and order-type-leadership would require the capability of military leaders, to be able to switch between the two fundamentally different leadership-methods and to understand the rationale behind changing over.

With regard to **“Humanistic general education in the Humboldtian sense”** are four reasons to be identified, which make this basic, democracy-relevant principle of the pluralistic state at the same time a democracy relevant, specific core functional principle of military leadership. Firstly the fact that the achieved level of humanistic general education, of the society as a whole, is the precondition for superimposing military-related general education, secondly the chance to exert beneficial effect on the democratic system of the state, via the policy-advice function of higher military leadership, thirdly the increase in democracy-political compatibility of armed forces that can be achieved by a higher level of humanistic general education, fourthly the rebuttal of the assumption, mission effectiveness could be sufficiently reached already by military professional “training”.

The core finding lies with the recognition of the impact, humanistic general education could unfold in the field of military-/ leadership science. In times of shrinking budgets, could the preservation of capabilities (soft skills) by tertiary educational institutions of the armed forces, offer one of the last opportunities, to maintain specific military leadership skills and to keep them available for a re-growth in case of need.

“Organic Leadership” is to be defined as a systemic interrelation-network comprising strategic goal finding, operational planning, tactical implementation, C4I, leadership in the narrower sense, management/administration and process-accompanying controlling within the armed forces. It can be proved that particularly the systemic interaction between the individual components of organic leadership, increases mission effectiveness and thus the capability of armed forces to support the state in securing internal democratic stability and stability-/democracy projection to the outside.

Particular emphasis is laid on the principle of leadership in the narrower sense, which is defined as the human-oriented treatment of subordinates that aims at esteem, respect for human dignity, as far as possible conflict-free interpersonal relations and that additionally is based on mutual trust and empathy. The proof for taking this principle serious lies with the decision, whether the subordinate is accepted as an equally important partner in a combat-team, or if he/she only is considered a part of the “machine” that has to accomplish the plans and orders of the superior levels. The main finding lies with comprehending the function of leadership in a narrower sense, as a bridging principle between strategic goal-setting and operational planning/implementation. By this principle an unimpeded strategic goal-setting at longest possible planning-horizons can be supported. But at the same time also short- to mid-term reductions in the present have to be accepted that will become unavoidable with regard to the long term survival of the democratic social order.

The section **“Strategy”** is to substantiate the democracy-supporting effect of the military functional principle “strategic leadership”. Furthermore it is to show that lacking strategic orientation might be

the factor by which the democratic survival of the state can be endangered most directly and drastically and that this lack currently exists. It also is to prove that higher military levels could effectively contribute to coping with this strategy-deficit, if strategic leadership would be approved as a core subject of military science and if future military leaders were academically educated towards this capability. It is subsequently deduced that just the undervaluation of the importance of the own strategic thinking can lead to the downfall of the democratic order (as it was demonstrated with regard to the classical example of France in 1940) and that also the underestimation of the strategic quality of the opponent's actions, might endanger the survival of the own state.

Two factors of contemporary strategic leadership that are particularly democracy-relevant, are to be identified. Firstly the long-term reach of strategic objectives, which often exceeds the term of the political leadership that had defined them. Secondly the necessity of restrictions in the present that must be imposed on the norm addressees for the sake of long-term survival of the democratic social order, although they can neither be easily understood nor accepted. Therefrom the finding was deduced that a level of military-internal values-understanding has to be kept up, which is necessary to guarantee a straight, unadorned and reliable report of the threat assessment, as political advice from the military towards the government. This piece of advice serves only as the imperative precondition for political decision makers, to meet the force-requirements that result from the threat-assessment, even when their necessary implementation would demand unpopular decisions.

The first key-result of this paragraph lies with the finding that a withdrawal from international missions respectively a fall back on the defense of EU-core territory, does not represent an option that will lead to democracy-based global security. The goal of a global peace-order will much rather request a balanced, comprehensive approach that bases upon forward stability/democracy projection and at the same time meets the demands, resulting from the mutual interdependence between internal democratic stability and external security.

The section “Strategy” results also in the key-finding that the constitutionally anchored separation between the responsibilities for internal and external security, can probably not be kept up any longer as strictly as hitherto. Apart from the necessary demand of an amalgamation of the role-profiles of military and police that is to be expected, an extremely critical demand for armed forces’ assistance missions, in support to forces of the interior, is likely to occur in cases of internal unrest.

The section **Values-“Constitution”** starts with the explanation of the reasons that had led to a definition of the current Western values-set via the metaphor of a “constitution”. Subsequently is the fundamental rationale of the values-based approach to be analyzed that has been deduced from the prevailing character of democracy-/stability-projecting missions. This character aims at “hearts and minds” of people in the operations area and has to be carried by the democratic maturity,

respectively the conviction of the engaged armed forces.

The phenomenon of „post-modernity“ is researched with regard to its role as an influence-factor on the values-order. Therefore is the basic-rationale of the values-based approach transferred to an analysis according to the two main factors, Inglehart/Welzel use in their world-value survey. It is shown that particularly a high parameter-value of “Self Expression”, decreases the willingness to undergo compulsory military service respectively to join the armed forces voluntarily. It also can be substantiated that the fatal combination of lacking will to contribute to collective efforts and the decreasing readiness to defend the country and its democratic political system, would make an uncontrolled development towards post-modernity, potentially democracy-imperiling.

The analysis of the phenomenon of „postmodernity” by the help of the analysis-interface results in the core-finding that the systemic difference between “modern” armed forces and postmodern society, must not be seen as *unavoidable*. It much rather is to be accepted as *indispensable*. It has to be understood that the above systemic difference at the same time is the *price for* and the *fundamental functional principle* of the sustainment of the postmodern values-canon of society. Therefore it should be avoided, to let this necessary systemic dissimilarity transform into a disagreeable, values-related incompatibility or to push armed forces into the role of a foreign body to the state.

The research on the ethical dimension of military leadership, in particular on the overall soldierly ethos, and its role as an influence-factor on the values-order, leads to the key-finding that a restriction of basic freedoms is unavoidable with regard to the fulfillment of the state’s demand for obedience to the primacy of politics-principle and that the right to resistance in a metaphorical sense can be used as a kind of “escape valve”, which makes the necessary restriction of basic freedoms more acceptable for the soldiers.

Furthermore it can be proved that the combination of leadership in the narrow sense and emotional staff satisfaction is best suited to support the *military* principle of “preventing the emergence of a state within the state”.

From the mutual connections found in the analysis, subsequently a **“Systemic Interdependency-network”** is to be derived. With the attempt to continuously extrapolate the recognized trends in the development of the interdependency-network shall a future prospect be outlined and a recommendation for the political decision-level be formulated that aims at an alignment of armed forces, which allows maintaining their effect for the democratic survival of the state even with limited budgetary means.

Chapter “**Results, Future Prospects, Recommendation, Verification**” includes the demonstration of the innovatory added value of the research, its useability for present force-planning processes and the applicability under a changed/future security-political situation. Above that, pragmatic recommendations are given on how to initiate a profound reorganization of armed forces towards optimal democracy-compatibility at a sustained level of mission-effectiveness.

The **Conclusion**, summarizes the essential key findings and presents the results of the “verification”/corroboration of the hypothesis.

(g) Summarized Conclusions

Starting from the axiom that democracies are, at least among each other, inhibited to apply military force in an offensive way and by trend peace-loving that they represent the only system so far, which has proved to be capable of providing peace in such a broad area and over such a long period, one will have to conclude that a reliable peace-order can only be achieved, based on the principle of democracy. Controversially discussed or not - one will have to admit that there will not be found any better principle for the mid-term future.

The world is far from a state, where the territorial coverage by genuine democracies would be big enough to provide global peace – therefore are and will armed forces be the means, indispensably needed to project, establish, defend and maintain peace in areas, where the democracy principle in a Western pluralistic sense only has to be implemented and where the local people will have to be convinced of the benefits of democracy.

For this purpose Western democracies will need forces, which are themselves imbued with the democratic principle, they are supposed to project, which are mission-effective to the outside, at the same time capable of defending the homebase (as the indispensable precondition for democracy-projection). These forces will have to be made sufficiently compatible with the prevailing values-canon of civil society, in order to avoid to be judged as a foreign body but on the other hand to endure (i.e. understand and accept) the degree of incompatibility that is needed to defend a postmodern society with “modern” operational-procedures.

Above that, they have to keep up the primacy of politics, to contribute with their highest leadership-levels to the strategic goal setting of the state/alliance/union and thus to be able to influence the security-related strategic orientation “with regard to contents” – and those future armed forces will have to comply with all those deduced tasks or at least generate the preconditions for their fulfillment, without raised defense-budgets. The analysis resulted in the finding that humanistic

general education in the Humboldtian sense is to be identified as the main instrument, by which armed forces can be aligned according to the tasks, listed above. And once this education has worked its effect via its influence on further military functional principles, the state will be able and should be willing to trust the democratic quality of its armed forces. “Democratic control” of armed forces in the understanding of keeping them with tight reins, permanently forcing them into a straitjacket through rigid regulations and immediately punishing them for the slightest attempt to deviate from given orders, when their own evaluation would promise a higher probability of success, would be a contradiction in terms – just like a continuous examination of educated and field-tested firefighters, due to the suspicion, they could be potential incendiaries.

The research was designed to support a systemic analysis, to be conducted by respective national users. This analysis-part was to deduce and suggest priorities for a systemic, force-planning related implementation of the overarching complex goal, described in the above paragraph. By the exemplary application of the elaborated systemic analysis model on selected, democracy relevant functional principles/ phenomena/factors of military leadership, have adjusting screws and the logical sequence of their appliance been identified and defined for the German language area, particularly for specific Austrian framework conditions that support a systemic alignment of armed forces towards a democracy-/stability-projecting mission-effectiveness.

Thereby factors have been identified that will have to be changed prior to others, if democracy-projecting and at the same time democracy-compatible armed forces are the goal of the envisaged reorganization. These driving-factors have been deduced due to the condition that their alteration must promise the highest systemic use, because they don't cause malfunctions elsewhere, which would outweigh the benefit of the modification.

The suggested analysis model was designed to offer the respective user also the option of a more thorough and profound assessment that supports approaches aiming at a principle, i.e. strategic re-thinking of the state's basic attitude towards its armed forces and their importance for the creation of a peace-order in the European, transatlantic and finally global context – instead of searching for solutions that work through a superficial economization of defense-budget-shares, like the models of Pooling and Sharing or Smart Defense. The latter are actually rather carried by the intention to spare financial means, while though achieving visibility of contributions - regardless if capability-gaps can be definitely closed/bridged by them.

By the results of the analysis and of the systemic interdependency network, the hypothesis could be substantiated with regard to the following assumptions:

- There is a natural contradiction (“inverse proportionality”) between democracy compatibility and mission effectiveness of armed forces and that imbuing these forces with

an internalized democratic values-understanding is the most appropriate way to overcome this tension.

- This internalized democratic values-understanding in turn could be confirmed as the indispensable precondition for the internal respectively democracy-compatible functioning of armed forces and for their capability to project democracy.
- As the principle of calming crises in the periphery before negative effects spill over to troop contributors' homebases, could be substantiated as the currently prevailing security political paradigm of Western democracies, the capability of armed forces to support this strategic approach effectively, has been proven to be the imperative precondition for the Western democracies' peaceful, long-term survival.
- A broad humanistic general education for soldiers of all ranks and the therefrom resulting values-awareness, represent the critical key factors for aligning armed forces towards a democracy-compatible and at the same time -supporting effectiveness.
- The initial assumption that influencing the values constitution could be a second adjusting screw of equal effectiveness, had to be abandoned, as any approach to alter the values-set, only would work in a long-term perspective and above that would have to be conducted for the entire society of a state – whereas raising the humanistic education level would already result in an improved democracy-compatibility, if it only were conducted for the military alone. So consequently, humanistic general education had to be affirmed as the primary adjusting screw for the democracy-compatible/-supporting reorganization of armed forces.
- It could be shown that it is possible to engineer a structured analysis model that transforms functional principles/phenomena/factors of military leadership as well as democratic functional principles of the state, each into an interface-appropriate order-logic, which allows to intersect the elements of both and to deduce firstly isolated interdependencies, secondly systemic interrelations between them. The derived interdependency network made it possible to identify driving (i.e. ones that have to be altered prior to others and that way ensure systemic success) respectively dependent factors and thus to deduce a sequence of military as well as political control measures, by which the requested democracy-relevant quality of armed forces can be achieved most effectively and systemically.
- The logical interdependence between intellectual history, tertiary education, organic-leadership, strategic-leadership and values-understanding had been deduced from the analysis model and transferred to the critical path/suggested solution-part of the systemic interdependency network, whereby a first feed-back to the hypothesis had been conducted.
- The assertion that the inward, democracy-constitutive effect of armed forces, has to be understood as the organic unity of the components defense against conventional and sub-

conventional threat from the outside, democracy-/peace-projection respectively securing access to vital resources abroad and continuous alignment to the mutual dependence between the demands of internal democratic stability and external security could be substantiated firstly by the intersection of the subcategories of “mission effectiveness” and their mutual interdependence (conventional/sub-conventional threat, projection, access to vital resources) and secondly by the analysis of the military functional principle “mutual interdependence between internal democratic stability and external security. The added value of the recognition of this interrelation lies with the finding that any reorganization of armed forces - when it aims at a systemic result with regard to the long-term peaceful survival of the state – must be carried out by taking into account all of the above analyzed components at once, i.e. by coping with the demand for their simultaneous and balanced implementation.

- The assumption “Western pluralistic, democratic states need mission-effective armed forces in order to maintain sovereignty to the outside and inwards, the latter being the indispensable precondition for guaranteeing basic democratic freedoms and for surviving as a democratic-value based community” could be corroborated via the interface-appropriate categorization of democratic functional principles of the state, the deduction of demands of the state towards the armed forces and the subsequent intersection with functional principles/phenomena/factors of military leadership.
- The assumption that it were imperative for the achievement of mission-effectiveness, to project democratic values-understanding of civil society consistently into the armed forces and down to the common soldier, could be substantiated via the following approaches:
 - The sequence “humanistic education, tertiary education, organic-leadership and applied mission-type-leadership”, allows for leadership superiority also with limited budgetary means, whereat leadership superiority in post-modern systems self-evidently aims at the lowest possible casualties in combat.
 - The analysis showed that most military leadership principles support primacy of politics at least partly. The main finding however was that the majority of affected leadership principles could be traced back to the humanistic general education complex, whereby the conclusion could be affirmed that the latter is particularly suited to be chosen the primary setting screw for envisaged reorganizations towards democracy-compatible and mission-effective armed forces.
- The assumption that armed forces, given the appropriate alignment, value-understanding and leadership, can feed-back a democracy-invigorating effect on civil society, could be substantiated by the deduction of the possibility to make the higher, military strategic level

participate in the decision-preparatory phase of strategic goal-setting of the state. The highly expert input, requested for policy-advice, turned out to be dependent again on humanistic and tertiary education.

- The logic of the assumption that the democracy-invigorating effect on society is necessary, particularly in order to countersteer the loss of the sense that a functioning democratic order depends on the synallagmatic relation between the contribution of the citizen to the state, and the (in return) granted participation in political decision-making, could be explained theoretically – the assumption itself, as well as a possible factual outcome, recognizable in political/military reality, could however not be confirmed.

(h) Proposals

Pragmatic recommendations on how to initiate a profound reorganization of armed forces will have to start with the proposal to conduct a first national assessment about the principle interrelation between the survival of a democratic social order and democracy relevant functional principles/phenomena/factors of military leadership - the structured analysis model supports this initial estimate by the findings represented in chapter “Assessment of the Respective User’s Initial Situation”, sub-chapter “Armed Forces and the Sovereignty of the State”.

If the ultimate goal of democracy-projection lies with global peace, then it will have to be recommended to think democracy-relevant interrelations always in the integration-framework-levels, suggested under sub-chapter “Categorization Dimensions / Participation”.

As the core-finding of the analysis lay with the dominant influence of humanistic general education on the democracy-political quality of armed forces that worked effect via its aggregate states “military-” respectively “leadership-science”, and as the demand for strategic assessment expertise is articulated in various fields of public life, it has to be recommended to establish a tertiary educational institution on university-level, under the responsibility of the armed forces that commits itself to military-/leadership-science in order to cope with the demand for strategic expertise and to contribute to the comprehensive defense-approach of the state by providing profound policy advice.

In order to counter the perceived deficit of strategic target-identification and -assessment expertise, a trans-ministerial staff-organization should be considered, directly responsible to the parliament or the federal chancellery. The top leadership-echelons of the armed forces could - via the instrument of policy advice - be called upon, to support strategy development, strategic goal-setting/-evaluation and to contribute to a professionally underpinned threat-analysis (thus creating a helpful corrective regarding excessively optimistic threat perceptions). Democracy relevance of this approach is given

because a long-term strategic orientation represents the imperative precondition for enduring democratic peace.

Should the insight prevail that the state needs a trans-ministerial staff under direct responsibility of the parliament/chancellery, for the purpose of strategic goal-setting, then it has to be recommended that military leadership-functions should contribute to this staff by suggestions regarding the decision-preparatory phase of the political target-definition process. The expertise for such a contribution would derive from the level of the tertiary military education that originally had to be raised for the purpose of achieving the necessary democracy-political quality of the armed forces, and that can be used now also for the participation in the strategic staff, described above.

Political leadership and force-planners are to be recommended to create and support a new discipline of leadership-science for complex, time-critical, unpredictable situations that could be derived from military-science and that could be developed under responsibility of the military, and that would represent a unique and imperative contribution to the requested strategic target identification and -assessment expertise.

Regardless of the specific national starting position and framework-conditions of the respective user of the analysis model, does the research-result allow for the general core-recommendation, to lay the main effort of reorganizations on raising the level of general humanistic education with the armed forces, to underpin military-/leadership-science (which has to grow up from this kind of education) by history of thought related findings, to transform the outcome of military-/leadership-science into a highly expert basis for operational and tactical leadership-training, to use the increased educational level for the reduction of asserted democracy-political incompatibility and at the same time for the purpose, to make the inevitable but also necessary remnant-incompatibility, digestible and acceptable for the military.

(i) New Academic/Scientific Results

New Scientific Results (including the Innovatory/Explanatory Added Value of the Research) start from the finding that a down-grading of armed forces without knowledge and without consideration of the systemic interrelation between their democracy-related functional principles, would destroy the fundament for the maintenance of the internal democratic stability of the state.

By the structured analysis model, it had been tried to catch up with this missing analysis of the above relationships and to provide a basis for a systemic advice to force-planners and the political level that couldn't be given so far.

Therefore lies the main-part of the achieved innovatory added value of the research, with the structured analysis model, which is a tool in a triple manner: A tool for the conduct of the research itself, a tool for the national users' individual evaluation, and finally the tool, the exemplary use of which results in the findings, which were to be transformed into recommendations to the political decision-level. The novelty of the approach primarily lies with

- the aptitude of the model, to be easily adapted to the national assessment-needs of the user because of starting from an initial-position for the evaluation that is deduced from the respective history of thought related development,
- the widest possible range of military functional principles, on the basis of which the synopsis is conducted,
- the *simultaneous* and balanced transformation of military functional principles as well as of functional principles of the state into an interface-appropriate order logic that allows for a systemic intersection of individual factors,
- the differentiation between “*driving*” and “*depending*”-factors, and the therefrom derived, suggested sequence of control- respectively steering measures that allow for a systemic reorganization of armed forces,
- the prioritization of phases of a reorganization that are derived from the suggested sequence of steering-measures and that allow for the system-compatible implementation of the most urgent process-steps, in case available budgetary means for the entire restructuring of forces are not sufficient,
- the identification of setting screws that allow to restructure armed forces systemically i.e. without generating unintended collateral disadvantages that outweigh the benefits of the entire reorganization-process.

Furthermore it had been deduced that armed forces must not mainly be considered a tolerated evil, but rather the *conditio sine qua non* for the peaceful survival of the state, which only on the basis of its intact sovereignty may grant democratic rights and freedoms. Paradoxically however – and there lies another portion of the innovatory added value of the research - is the security, created by the armed forces, at the same time precondition for the carelessness of the people, which only enables the questioning of military defense and the depreciation of military forces in general, and which thus significantly weakens the willingness to confess to a fortified democracy.

By the explanation of dependencies between democratic functional principles of the state and democracy-relevant military principles on the basis of a systemic interdependencies-network, had *a tool been offered to the political decision-making level as well as to force planners* that helps to

secure peace and state-sovereignty as the basis for a democratic social order, through effective armed forces and that at the same time allows to counteract the paradox mentioned above, in a democracy-compatible way.

(j) Possible Practical Applicability of the Research Results

The usability of the research results is to be evaluated with regard to their aptitude to support force-planning processes and armed forces-related political decision making, including their potential collateral use for the civil society. Usability in this understanding had been achieved with regard to the following results:

- The analysis of the history of thought related development that had led to the democracy-policy related starting position of the individual user of the model, contributes to a better understanding of national peculiarities respectively of different notions concerning the perception of the democracy-principle and thus supports a better multinational cooperation in defense matters.
- Using armed forces as a “sample” for the appraisal of the values-orientation of society – a sample that is particularly telling because the internal functional logic of armed forces and the threat one would be exposed to, when serving with a military unit under combat-conditions - makes the importance of values and their necessary restriction, extremely visible and painfully perceivable. Thus a starting point for force-planners as well as for the state can be given, to influence and countersteer values-development as a precondition for the democratic quality of armed forces respectively of the society as a whole.
- The compilation of the current democracy-political quality of armed forces provides the basis for the identification of a possible request to catch up with the desired standard.
- The detection of democracy-political strengths and weaknesses of the armed forces offers different strategic options for the reorganization of armed forces, if the threat-scenario allows such a choice.
- Scenario-based planning that includes the effects of an overvalued democracy-compatibility on mission effectiveness as well as approaches, which gradually sacrifice democratic quality of armed forces for an increase of combat-readiness, allows the definition of a national strategic profile for foreign missions (i.e. to give an answer to the strategic question, if the respective user’s current ratio between democracy-compatibility and mission effectiveness

does rather predestine towards humanitarian-, peace enforcing missions or towards operations, which aim at extorting access to vital resources abroad, when they are detained by troublemakers in order to hold Western democracies ransom).

- The detection of synergy-effects between humanistic general education (for the purpose of the internal democratic functioning of armed forces) and the beneficial influence of higher educated soldiers/military leaders on civil society as soon as they leave active service.
- The detection of setting screws for a systemic restructuring of armed forces towards a democracy-compatible and at the same time mission effective aggregate state.
- Advice to the political decision-level and to force-planners on how to restructure armed forces towards democracy-compatibility and mission effectiveness at lowest possible costs, by the use of the above setting screws and the suggested sequence of their operationalization.
- The creation of a tertiary educational institution that offers the academic discipline of “Leadership Science” (leadership in time-critical, complex, hardly predictable situations) for future leaders in the fields of politics, diplomacy, private business and military.
- The side-effect of an abstracted leadership expertise, derived from leadership-philosophy (in particular from mission-oriented leadership) can be used by private business leadership – whereby a higher degree of „quasi-“ democratic participation of co-workers could be achieved.
- A contribution to the integration of soldiers of different cultural-/ethnic background into military units – whereby, in a longer run, also a contribution could be made to the integration of citizens of different cultural-/ethnic background into public social life.
- Transfer of the democracy-political sensitivity that is achieved by the state through the use of the analysis-model, to superior integration-frameworks – whereby long-term peace-oriented approaches can also be supported on a transnational/global level.

(k) List of Publications Related to the Topic

HOLLERER Franz / PEISCHEL Wolfgang: „Militärwissenschaft“ als Antwort auf die neuen Anforderungen an das Rollenprofil des Offiziers, in Armis et Litteris, Militärwissenschaftliche Schriftenreihe des FH-Studienganges „Militärische Führung“ an der Theresianischen Militärakademie Wiener Neustadt, Band 1, Interdisziplinäre Beiträge zur militärischen Führung, 1998, pages 21-52.

PEISCHEL Wolfgang: Zur Entwicklung eines Zweigespanns aus Militär- und Führungswissenschaft, in FRANK Johann, MATYAS Walter (Hrsg.): Strategie und Sicherheit 2013 - Chancen und Grenzen europäischer militärischer Integration, eine Publikation des österreichischen Bundesministeriums für Landesverteidigung und Sport, Böhlau 2013, ISBN 978-3-205-79467-7, pages 475-488.

PEISCHEL, Wolfgang: Die Entwicklung eines Zweigespanns aus Militär- und Führungswissenschaft – im Sinn eines Vermächtnisses Carl von Clausewitz‘ ?, in CLAUSEWITZ-GESELLSCHAFT [Hrsg.]: Jahrbuch 2013, Band 9, ISBN 978-3-9810794-9-4, 2014.

PEISCHEL, Wolfgang: Geistesgeschichtliche Grundlagen operativer Führung im deutschsprachigen Raum, in Österreichische Militärische Zeitschrift, ÖMZ – Ausgabe 5/2002, pages 547-560.

PEISCHEL, Wolfgang: Zum Nutzen der Definition des Strategiebegriffes – eine perspektivische Betrachtung“ in BIRK, Eberhard (Hrsg.) im Auftrag der Gneisenau-Gesellschaft der OSLw e.V., GNEISENAU BLÄTTER – Band 9 (2010), „Technik-Innovation-Strategie“, herausgegeben im Auftrag der Gneisenau-Gesellschaft der OSLw e.V. von Dr. Eberhard Birk, pages 30-41, Fürstenfeldbruck, <http://www.gneisenau-gesellschaft.de>

HOLLERER Franz / PEISCHEL Wolfgang: „Leadership“ - ein Führungsprinzip zwischen Anspruch und Wirklichkeit, in Bundesministerium für Inneres (Hrsg.): .SIAK-Journal – Zeitschrift für Polizeiwissenschaft und polizeiliche Praxis – ISSN 1813-3495, .SIAK-Journal – Vierteljahresschrift: 8.Jahrgang, Ausgabe 2/2011, pages 18-28.

(I) Professional Academic Curriculum Vitae



Brig MMag. Wolfgang PEISCHEL

Address

Office: National Defence Academy, Vienna

AG Stiftgasse, Rossauerlände 1

A-1090 VIENNA

Phone: 0043 50201 10 28900

Email: wolfgang.peischel@bmlvs.gv.at

Nationality: Austria

Family Status

Born 030756 in Vienna, father Dr. Gottfried Peischel, mother Ernestine Peischel, married to Martina Scharinger

Military/Scientific Career

1966-1974 Gymnasium, 1210 Vienna

1982-1985 Military Academy Wiener Neustadt

1991-1994 General Staff Course, National Defence Academy VIENNA

1991-1997 University of Vienna, Master-Studies Political Science

1994-1999 Department of Military Strategy, MoD Vienna

2001 Commander Infantry Regiment Vienna

2001-2008 Director Force Planning / General Staff

since 2009 Editor in Chief of “Austrian Military Journal” (ÖMZ)

List of Publications

Chapters in Books

PEISCHEL, Wolfgang: Protection of Cultural Property within the Framework of Civil Military Cooperation, in MICEWSKI Edwin R. / SLADEK Gerhard: Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict, A Challenge in Peace Support Operations, Publication Series of the National Defense Academy Vienna No. 4/02 and the Austrian Society for the Protection of Cultural Property No. 7, ISBN 3-901328-66-1, 1st Edition 2002, pp. 139-153.

HOLLERER Franz / PEISCHEL Wolfgang: „Militärwissenschaft“ als Antwort auf die neuen Anforderungen an das Rollenprofil des Offiziers, in Armis et Litteris, Militärwissenschaftliche Schriftenreihe des FH-Studienganges „Militärische Führung“ an der Theresianischen Militärakademie Wiener Neustadt, Band 1, Interdisziplinäre Beiträge zur militärischen Führung, 1998, pages 21-52.

PEISCHEL Wolfgang: Das operative Führungsprinzip als idealtypisches Lösungsmodell für komplexe Aufgabenstellungen im militärischen Anwendungsbereich, in Armis et Litteris, Militärwissenschaftliche Schriftenreihe des FH-Studienganges „Militärische Führung“ an der Theresianischen Militärakademie Wiener Neustadt, 5/00, Umgang mit Komplexität, Führen in komplexen Systemen, 2000, pages 45-71.

PEISCHEL Wolfgang: Denken im Rahmen der operativen Führung, in Armis et Litteris, Militärwissenschaftliche Schriftenreihe des FH-Studienganges „Militärische Führung“ an der Theresianischen Militärakademie Wiener Neustadt, 10/01, Denken und militärische Führung – eine Herausforderung für die (Aus-) Bildung, 2001, pages 111-140.

PEISCHEL Wolfgang: Die Auswirkung globaler militärischer Entwicklungstrends auf die mittel- bis langfristige Streitkräfteentwicklung europäischer Staaten, in PUCHER Johann, FRANK Johann, (Hrsg.): Strategie und Sicherheit 2011, Globale Herausforderungen – globale Antworten, Böhlau Verlag 2011, ISBN 978-3-205-78630-6, pages 131-142.

PEISCHEL Wolfgang: Kulturelle Diversität als Bedingungsgröße für die militärische Führung, in EBNER Georg (Hrsg.): Interkulturalität als Instrumentarium für Einsatz und Führung – Teil 2, Schriftenreihe der Landesverteidigungsakademie, 5/2013, pages 17-36.

PEISCHEL Wolfgang: Wasser als strategische Ressource, in Kostbares Wasser, Trinkwassersicherheit – ein Gebot der Stunde?, Schriftenreihe der ABC-Abwehrschule – Band 2, in Kooperation mit dem Umweltbundesamt, April 2013, pages 19-30.

PEISCHEL Wolfgang: Zur Entwicklung eines Zweigespanns aus Militär- und Führungswissenschaft, in FRANK Johann, MATYAS Walter (Hrsg.): Strategie und Sicherheit 2013 - Chancen und Grenzen europäischer militärischer Integration, eine Publikation des österreichischen Bundesministeriums für Landesverteidigung und Sport, Böhlau 2013, ISBN 978-3-205-79467-7, pages 475-488.

PEISCHEL, Wolfgang: Die Entwicklung eines Zweigespanns aus Militär- und Führungswissenschaft – im Sinn eines Vermächnisses Carl von Clausewitz‘ ?, in CLAUSEWITZ-GESELLSCHAFT [Hrsg.]: Jahrbuch 2013, Band 9, ISBN 978-3-9810794-9-4, 2014.

Journals and Internet

PEISCHEL, Wolfgang / HOLLERER Franz: „Militärwissenschaft“ als Antwort auf die neuen Anforderungen an das Rollenbild des Offiziers, in Österreichische Militärische Zeitschrift, ÖMZ – Ausgabe 4/1999, pages 439-450.

PEISCHEL, Wolfgang: Geistesgeschichtliche Grundlagen operativer Führung im deutschsprachigen Raum, in Österreichische Militärische Zeitschrift, ÖMZ – Ausgabe 5/2002, pages 547-560.

PEISCHEL, Wolfgang: Zum Nutzen der Definition des Strategiebegriffes – eine perspektivische Betrachtung“ in BIRK, Eberhard (Hrsg.) im Auftrag der Gneisenau-Gesellschaft der OSLw e.V., GNEISENAU BLÄTTER – Band 9 (2010), „Technik-Innovation-Strategie“, herausgegeben im Auftrag der Gneisenau-Gesellschaft der OSLw e.V. von Dr. Eberhard Birk, pages 30-41, Fürstenfeldbruck, <http://www.gneisenau-gesellschaft.de>

PEISCHEL Wolfgang / PLATZER Christian: Guiding-Principles of Pooling & Sharing, forwarded to the seminar on Central European Solutions for Pooling & Sharing Capabilities, Budapest, 25-26 oct 2010, review on the seminar, Tamás Csiki, assistant research fellow, Institute for Strategic Defence Studies.

HOLLERER Franz / PEISCHEL Wolfgang: „Leadership“ - ein Führungsprinzip zwischen Anspruch und Wirklichkeit, in Bundesministerium für Inneres (Hrsg.): .SIAK-Journal – Zeitschrift für Polizeiwissenschaft und polizeiliche Praxis – ISSN 1813-3495, .SIAK-Journal – Vierteljahresschrift: 8.Jahrgang, Ausgabe 2/2011, pages 18-28.

PEISCHEL, Wolfgang: Security Sector Reform (SSR) with a focus on CEE-states - a possible way ahead; the paper had been forwarded and offered for a publication in AARMS in 2011.

PEISCHEL, Wolfgang: Editorials, in Österreichische Militärische Zeitschrift, ÖMZ – Ausgaben 1-6/2009.

PEISCHEL, Wolfgang: Editorials, in Österreichische Militärische Zeitschrift, ÖMZ – Ausgaben 1-6/2010.

PEISCHEL, Wolfgang: Editorials, in Österreichische Militärische Zeitschrift, ÖMZ – Ausgaben 1-6/2011.

PEISCHEL, Wolfgang: Editorials, in Österreichische Militärische Zeitschrift, ÖMZ – Ausgaben 1-6/2012.

PEISCHEL, Wolfgang: Editorials, in Österreichische Militärische Zeitschrift, ÖMZ – Ausgaben 1-6/2013.

PEISCHEL, Wolfgang: Editorials, in Österreichische Militärische Zeitschrift, ÖMZ – Ausgaben 1-3/2014.

