Dear Readers,

In many fields of global cooperation we are witnessing pressures for re-nationalisation, ranging from rising tensions about trade policy to conflicting views of how to mitigate global warming. Yet, the question of how to balance global cooperation and national sovereignty is currently most hotly debated in the field of international migration policy – a policy field that has recently received more attention globally. Contributions in this newsletter address this topic from multiple angles: Micheline van Riemsdijk analyzes the tensions between safeguarding lives and rights of migration and national sovereign rights in the negotiations of the Global Compact on Migration in the run-up to the Marrakesh Conference. Marianne Marchand explains that while the city-migration nexus is given more attention in international organizations there is still much to be gained from assemblage thinking about transnational cities to better understand how both cities and migrant communities are being co-transformed. Stephen Scheel, whom we welcome as a Junior Professor for Transnational Cooperation and Migration Research at the University of Duisburg-Essen, uncovers how the knowledge practices that produce migration statistics underwrite notions of migration as something that is easy to manage while omitting references to the limits of reliable numbers on migration. Taken together, these contributions inspire ways to think about internationally orchestrated yet locally and nationally calibrated migration policies that would transcend polarized debates that oppose the global and national in all too simplistic ways.

Apart from the special focus on global migration policy, let me also recommend the ‘Reviews’ and ‘Publications’ sections to you that feature the multifaceted output of the Centre’s fellows and researchers.

I wish you a peaceful and relaxing holiday season!

Sigrid Quack
Director
The governance of international migration is a key political issue that currently receives much attention from policymakers, voters, and the news media. As I am writing this article for the newsletter, newspapers have reported on the exodus of EU citizens from the UK in anticipation of Brexit, President Trump’s response to the migrant caravan that is approaching the United States (US), and the stalling of the repatriation of Rohingya refugees from Bangladesh to Myanmar. These recent media stories illustrate the contentious nature of migration policies and a lack of international cooperation on migration governance.

The governance of international migration has been marked by fragmentation, a lack of coordination, and an absence of a global institutional framework that governs all categories of migration. Despite various attempts to improve the governance framework, powerful immigrant-receiving states have long opposed a global agreement. This status quo changed during the 2015 European ‘refugee crisis’ when more than one million people fled crisis-prone areas or sought a better life in Europe. As receiving states struggled to control admission to their territories and process asylum claims, the weaknesses of the existing migration system was exposed. These issues coupled with a high death toll in the Mediterranean region renewed calls for better governance of the international movement of people and the safeguarding of lives.

In response to these calls, the UN organized a high-level summit on Migrants and Refugees in New York City in September 2016. At this meeting, the UN member states unanimously adopted the New York Declaration, a non-binding political agreement that acknowledged that ‘no one State can manage [large] movements on its own’ and committed states to a shared responsibility for refugees and migrants ‘in a humane, sensitive, compassionate and people-centred manner.’ With the signing of the Declaration, the 193 UN member states committed to 18 months of consultation sessions and subsequent negotiations to create a Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration (GCM) and a Global Compact for Refugees (GCR). In December 2017, the US announced that it would no longer participate in negotiations over the GCM, arguing that it was not compatible with its national migration policies.

The adoption of the New York Declaration and the UN member states’ unanimous decision to develop the GCM and GCR were unprecedented in the history of migration governance. Even though efforts have been undertaken since the 1990s to develop a global migration framework, the GCM is the first

continued on page 4
Routledge Global Cooperation Series: new editorial board, book proposals welcome

Initiated by the Centre’s founding directors Tobias Debiel, Claus Leggewie and Dirk Messner, the Routledge Global Cooperation Series provides a publishing platform for advancing research on global cooperation by bringing together researchers from different disciplines and areas across the globe. After Claus Leggewie’s retirement, the new co-directors of the Centre, Sigrid Quack and Jan Aart Scholte, have assumed his position on the editorial board. ‘Many of today’s problems such as climate change, international conflicts or forced migration cannot be solved by nation states alone. They require intensified cooperation on a global scale. One of the biggest challenges of our time, however, is how to achieve cooperation in a culturally diverse and politically contested global world. The Routledge Global Cooperation Series’, Quack and Scholte agree, ‘provides space for innovative answers to this question’. Fellows at the Centre make regular contributions to the series but other projects are explicitly invited (see also: ’Reviews’ and ’Last Page’).

Stephan Scheel Junior Professor for Transnational cooperation and Migration Research at the University of Duisburg-Essen

On 1st December 2018, Stephan Scheel joined the Universität Duisburg-Essen (UDE) as Junior Professor for Transnational Cooperation and Migration Research at the Institute of Sociology. Before coming to UDE, Stephan worked as a post-doctoral researcher in the ERC project ‘Processing Citizenship’ project at the University of Twente and the ERC project ‘ARITHMUS – How Data Make a People’ project at Goldsmiths, University of London. Stephan holds a PhD from the Department for Politics and International Studies at the Open University in Milton Keynes (UK). His thesis has been awarded the Michael Nicholson Thesis Prize of the British International Studies Association (BISA) in 2015. The study investigates how migrants appropriate mobility within biometric border regimes and will be published by Routledge in April 2019. Stephan has published widely on migration and border security in numerous academic journals. At UDE, Stephan will develop research projects in the context of the Käte Hamburger Kollegs/Centre for Global Cooperation Research as well as the research profile area ‘Change in Contemporary Societies’ and the Interdisciplinary Centre for Integration and Migration Research (InZentIM). Read more about his research agenda on page 10 f.

‘Dix femmes qui pensent l’Afrique et le monde’: Olivia U. Rutazibwa among ten women distinguished in a Le Monde Special

We are proud for Olivia, whom Le Monde included recently in a remarkable ensemble of women who are African or Afrodescendants and ‘who devote their lives to deciphering the colonial past, the slave trade and the place of women in this painful memory to bring about a world in which black women will have their full place’. Olivia stayed at the Centre in 2015 and 2016 and worked on her project ‘Agaciro, Black Power and Autonomous Recovery. A Decolonial Study of Sovereignty and Self-determination’. Precisely at the interface between journalism and academic science, Olivia focuses on decolonization as a pathway for minds and habits prone to change over time. She challenges notions of development aid, and stresses that is is important not to « jeter le bébé avec l’eau du bain». But the generous act of aid should be transformed into a mode of conscious ‘reparation’ involving the knowledge about something that went terribly wrong. Olivia recently co-edited two volumes on decolonization topics. A short review of both titles can be found in our Review section (page 9 f).
agreement to cover all aspects of migration. In July 2018, all UN member states except for the US approved the final version of the GCM. It contains 23 objectives that, among others, aim to reduce vulnerabilities in migration and save lives, address human trafficking, improve inclusion and social cohesion in host societies, promote sustainable development opportunities in sending states, reduce the costs of remittances, and provide an international framework for return migration. The GCM is scheduled to be formally approved at an intergovernmental conference in Marrakech on December 10–11 2018. The planned approval of the GCM, however, has been met by opposition from populist parties and right-wing governments. Their critiques are anchored in four key arguments. First, they argue that the agreement undermines national sovereignty. While the GCM states that it ‘upholds the sovereignty of States and their obligations under international law,’ critics argue that the global agreement undermines states’ rights to control entry and stay in their national territories and that the GCM harms national interests. Second, they critique the documents’ conceptualization of international migration as a human right, arguing that the GCM promotes undocumented migration. Third, the right-wing governments in Hungary and Austria have claimed that the GCM blurs the line between legal and illegal migration. Fourth, opponents to the GCM worry that the document will be legally binding through backdoor policies, even though the final version explicitly states that it is a non-binding agreement. Critics fear that migrants can use the document to make claim to social services and residency rights. These four concerns are all related to national sovereignty or fears that the GCM will expand the rights of migrants. These arguments are also reflected in the rationales of states that have decided not to sign the GCM document in Marrakech in December. Hungary pulled out five days after the July 2018 agreement, citing concerns about national sovereignty and arguing that the GCM facilitates migration. Australia followed suit on July 25, disagreeing with the GCM’s stance on migrant detention as a last resort. Since then, Austria, Poland, the Czech Republic, Bulgaria and Estonia have also announced that they will not sign the GCM. The Swiss government has delayed signing and will schedule a debate in Parliament before it decides to adopt the compact. This decision is surprising as Switzerland co-facilitated the consultation and negotiation sessions for the GCM. These concerns expressed by national governments illustrate the difficulty of balancing national sovereign rights with a desire to safeguard the lives and rights of migrants who cross international borders. While these critiques merit attention, it is also important to focus on the achievements of the GCM. Only five years ago it was unthinkable that UN member states would discuss the global governance of migration at a high-level summit. The GCM provides a historic opportunity to improve international cooperation on migration and the protection of migrants by providing pathways for safe, orderly and regular migration. That said, it remains to be seen whether the GCM will have a significant impact on the governance of migration. Since the agreement is non-legally binding it depends on the willingness of member states to operationalize the objectives laid out in the GCM. In addition, as pointed out by Jan Aart Scholte in a seminar on the GCM at the Centre, the global compacts may be a stop-gap solution to show that states are doing something in the wake of the refugee crisis without really committing to the cause. It will be interesting to see what is going to happen in the time leading up to the meeting in Marrakech and its aftermath.

The author was a fellow at the Centre in 2018. She can be reached at micheline.vanriemsdijk@kultgeog.uu.se.
Call for Papers

Conference on 'Counter-narratives to Regional Cooperation: Contesting European Union'
13–14 May 2019, Duisburg

27.11.2018 At a time when transnational and international cooperation increasingly faces aggressive criticism and outright opposition, this conference in Duisburg will explore the particular case of counter-narratives to European integration. A joint call by the Jean Monnet Centre of Excellence for the Study of a Transnational Europe (CESTE) in Portsmouth and the Centre for Global Cooperation Research (GCR21) invites contributions based on original research addressing actors and narratives in a structured manner, both to strengthen comparative perspectives and to facilitate a possible later collective publication. The conference is organized by Wolfram Kaiser (University of Portsmouth) and Richard McMahon (University College London) in cooperation with the Centre in Duisburg.

From Brazil to the Philippines and the US to Hungary, political polarisation and international tensions are growing. Intellectuals and organised social and political groups are using ‘communitarian’ narratives to produce a churn of new or reinvigorated and refined anti-cosmopolitan narratives. Whether motivated ideologically by right-wing ethnocentric nationalism or left-wing rejection of economic globalisation, they seek a partisan advantage in domestic and transnational politics and try to reshape international relations in a more intergovernmental and autarkic manner. Democratically elected political leaders have strongly promoted and sought to legitimise such narratives, from US President Donald Trump’s nationalistic rhetoric and rejection of international treaties to Hungarian Prime Minister Victor Orbán’s advocacy of ‘illiberal democracy’ as a challenge to the European Union’s normative order.

As the world’s most intensive experiment in regional integration, European Union (as something that can be more than and different from the European Union as an organization) is a lightning rod and key test for the rising opponents of regional cooperation and globalism.

Please submit proposals to both organisers, Wolfram Kaiser (Wolfram.Kaiser@online.de) and Richard McMahon (rchumac@yahoo.com) no later than 5 January 2019. The successful applicants will be notified no later than 20 January 2019.

Please visit our website and read (download) the full text of this call for details and further information: www.gcr21.org.
When Donald Trump became president in 2017, many people were concerned about his anti-immigrant views enunciated during his campaign. Almost immediately after the elections, several mayors announced that their cities would provide sanctuary to undocumented migrants. They argued that the federal government’s strict policies toward undocumented migrants would have many negative consequences, including the separation of migrant families and the deportation of migrants who had lived almost their entire life in the United States and do not really know their country of origin.

This example illustrates that cities are playing a role in migration governance, something to which policymakers as well as academics have only recently started to pay attention.* In the international community this has been manifested with the International Organization for Migration (IOM) placing cities on the agenda in 2015 with its *World Migration Report on Migrants and Cities*, accompanied by a high-level conference on the same topic. This was followed in 2016 with UN-Habitat III including the city-migration nexus in the *New Urban Agenda* and, even the World Economic Forum (WEF) dedicated its 2017 report to migration and cities. It is not surprising then, that the discussions around the Global Compact for Migration have also included cities.

Traditionally migration issues have been seen as the prerogative of the (national) state, exercising its sovereignty. The idea that cities play, or should play, a role in the governance of migration opens up new terrain for analysis and policymaking. This is not to say that local governments haven’t been involved in the implementation of national migration policies for considerable time. For instance, city governments have been the *de facto* service providers to asylum seekers, attending to their housing, educational and health needs. What then is different about the recent suggestion that cities should become actors in migration governance?

Both the IOM and UN-Habitat call for cities to take a more pro-active role in migration governance, arguing that not only more than half of the world population lives in urban areas, but also that migrants tend to move to cities. As cities have become the primary destination for migrants, it is important to look at how they impact on receiving cities. The IOM, UN-Habitat and the WEF are clear that migration affects cities in multiple ways. On the one hand, internal and international migration contribute to urban growth and cities’ diversity. It is estimated that migrants’ share of the Global Gross Domestic Product is about 9.4% in 2015 and that second-generation migrants in particular ‘are among the population’s strongest economic and fiscal contributors’ (WEF 2017: 30). While it is difficult to provide overall estimates on cities, there

*continued on page 8*
Current Projects


in circles: current fellows · in hexagons: research group leaders

Blayne Haggart Adam Sandor Tamirace Fakhoury Ying Shen Marianne Marchand Philip Liste Bettina Mahlert Andreas Thiel Franz Mauelshagen Wouter Werner Katja Freistein Frank Gadinger Volker Heins Nina Schneider Christine Unrau
are clear indications that over time migrants contribute positively to local economies.

On the other hand, migrants often have special needs that require attention. These needs may include language training or psychological attention if it concerns refugees recently arrived from conflict or war zones. Moreover, among the challenges that cities face in absorbing migrants are not only issues like housing, education and health, but also transportation, safety, sanitation and adequate utilities, as well as integration and social cohesion (IOM 2015; UN-Habitat 2016; WEF 2017).

Yet, the connection between cities and migration goes beyond cities’ roles in the governance of migration. As several scholars have pointed out, the city-migration nexus not only addresses how cities relate to and possibly transform the lives of migrants, but also how migrants contribute to and transform cities in the process. In this context assemblage thinking has been very useful to unravel these dynamic processes. As urban assemblage thinking suggests, cities are being produced and reproduced through assemblages that are stabilized through the relations between different actors and physical objects. For instance, the relations among German expats, the institutions and physical sites of the Volkswagen and Audi factories, the German school, a local government interested in becoming more competitive, local universities, and gated communities have generated a more or less stabilized assemblage that in turn has produced a particular city of Puebla (Mexico). However, this particular city of Puebla may not be the same ‘Puebla’ that resonates with returned migrants or so-called transmigrants from Central America. Their relations to other actors and physical surroundings may very well produce a distinct ‘Puebla’.

Relying on insights of assemblage thinking Federico Besserer and his research group have introduced the idea of the transnational city, referring to the transnational spaces in which migrants move and operate. Expanding upon the example discussed in the previous paragraph, the city of Puebla as produced by Poblano migrants in relation to a transnational labor market, their transnational mobility, as well as physical surroundings is a non-contiguous city, reaching to parts of New Jersey and New York in the US. This transnational city (and community) of Puebla is commonly known as ‘Puebla York.’ Interestingly through the creation of Puebla as a transnational city, a transnational identity has been generated—the identity of Poblano migrants in New York (and New Jersey). This transnational assemblage, in turn, has also produced (while simultaneously being the product of) many transnational and bilateral activities between the cities as well as states of New York and Puebla, between academic and cultural institutions in both cities, and between civil society organizations.

The question raised at the beginning of this article was why should we take cities seriously in migration governance? In the article I argue that we should. Not just because a majority of migrants are moving to cities or because cities are the immediate environment in which migrants find their ways in a new country, but also because in these encounters both cities and migrant communities are being transformed, acquire new, multi-layered identities and generate new transnational linkages. To assume that cities are merely governmental entities which can implement migration policies developed at the national level, would not only show a misunderstanding of their capacities, but also ignore the transformations that are taking place.

References


The author is a senior fellow currently based at the Centre. She can be reached at marchand@gcr21.uni-due.de.
Reviews


The book made its start at a workshop catchily titled 'Mapping, Mercator and Modernity' in Duisburg (where else?) and compiles a distributed research process of a few years. Authors from a range of disciplines explore mapping and politics across three sections. 'Contestations' introduces the reader to contemporary developments and explores the politics of mapping as a form of knowledge and contestation. 'Governance' analyses mapping as a set of institutional practices in the realms of urban politics, refugee control, health crises and humanitarian interventions and new techniques of biometric regulation and autonomic computation. 'Imaginaries' provides examples of future-oriented analytical frameworks, highlighting the transformation of mapping in an age of digital technologies of control and regulation.


The Handbook introduces and develops cutting-edge analytical frameworks that draw on Black, decolonial, feminist, indigenous, Marxist and postcolonial thought as well as a multitude of intellectual traditions from across the globe. Alongside empirical issue areas that remain crucial to assessing the impact of European and Western colonialism on global politics, the book introduces new issue areas that have arisen due to the mutating structures of colonial and imperial rule.


Andrew Jordan et.al. (2018) (eds.): Governing Climate Change: Polycentricity in Action?

Touching upon one of the Centre’s research fields, polycentric governance thinking claims to be much more tolerant of overlap, redundancy and duplication in governance. Under this view, the fact that multiple governing units take initiatives at the same time is seen not as inefficient and fragmented, but as an opportunity for learning about what works best in different domains. This 20-chapter book brings together contributions from 40 of the world’s foremost experts to provide the first systematic test of the ability of polycentric thinking to explain and enhance societal attempts to govern climate change. The book is linked to an open online course (MOOC) developed by the Open University of the Netherlands, and, thus, seeks to provide a rich set of relevant learning materials.


The contributions in this German-language publication develop a novel perspective on labour and labour markets that transcends the national frame of reference. Authors include the Centre’s director and are members of the Department of Sociology at the University of Duisburg-Essen. This publication enhances the university’s expertise in labour research in the transnational realm. The authors scrutinize in detail: (1) the cross-border mobility of labour force, (2) the cross-border mobility of labour and knowledge, and (3) the emergence of related European, transnational and global institutions.

Studying the Politics of (Non-)Knowledge in Border and Migration Management

by Stephan Scheel

From December 2018 onwards I will hold a Junior Professorship in Transnational Cooperation and Migration Research at the University of Duisburg-Essen. I will use this welcome opportunity to develop a research program in the next six years that consists of two lines: An International Political Sociology of Migration which tries to transcend the methodological nationalism that continues to shape both IR theory and the field of migration studies; and secondly the study of what I call the Politics of (Non-)Knowledge in Border and Migration Management. In the following I will focus, due to space constraints, on briefly outlining this second line of research.

Inspired by insights from Science and Technology Studies (STS) on the performativity of knowledge practices, this line of research investigates how knowledge production about migration shapes contemporary programs and regimes of border and migration management. Its basic premise is that migration constitutes an abstraction that does not exist as an intelligible object of government apart from the practices used to know and quantify it. This is because ‘migration’ refers to the practices of millions of people whose decisions and movements are translated, via a range of inscription devices and method assemblages, into numbers, colourful charts, graphs and other forms of representation such as policy briefs which ultimately serve decision-makers as a basis for ‘evidence-based policy-making’. Hence, what we know as migration is mediated by knowledge practices like statistics, surveys or censuses. The crucial point is that knowledge practices like statistics do not just describe or quantify an already existing reality ‘out there’. They help to constitute migration as a discernible, negotiable object of government. How migration is enacted depends however on the methods, classifications, data sources and forms of representation that are mobilised for the production of knowledge about migration. In other words, different methods and devices of knowledge production will generate different versions of migration.

Starting from this understanding of knowledge practices as performative, this line of research studies the Politics of (Non-)Knowledge in Border and Migration Management. It will focus, in particular, on how innovative methods affect how we know and understand migration, as well as the related question, how knowledge practices shape the formulation of migration policies and the design of related regimes of government, including forms of cooperation and conflict in the field of global migration governance. To raise and study these questions is particularly important at a time when innovative surveillance technologies, such as satellite images or drones for the patrolling of borders, as well as various sources of Big Data are promoted as means for producing more fine-grained, real-time knowledge about migration.

A first output of this line of reasoning is an article, co-authored with Dr. Funda Ustek-Spilda, which will soon be published in the journal Environment and Planning D: Society and Space. The piece shows...
Reviews

Sara de Jong, Rosalba Icaza, Olivia U. Rutazibwa (eds.): Decolonization and Feminisms in Global Teaching and Learning

The structure of this collection reflects the synergies between decolonial and feminist thought in its four parts, which offer reflections on the politics of knowledge; the challenging pathways of finding your voice; the constraints and possibilities of institutional contexts; and the relation between decolonial and feminist thought and established academic disciplines. Contributions deal with different settings from prison to academia and with different regional contexts. Co-editor Olivia U. Rutazibwa in her own contribution critically reflects on practices of development aid. Being a decisive contribution to critical studies on knowledge production, these essays argue that the decolonization of universities is only strengthened when connected to feminist and critical queer and gender perspectives.


Resilience refers to the ability of individuals, groups and societies to withstand and recover from external shocks. This pioneering book-length comparative study, partly written during the authors’ stay at the Centre, examines resilience as it is experienced across different countries, such as the UK, US, France, Germany and EU. Cases from policy sectors including national security, counterterrorism, civil protection, disaster risk reduction, critical infrastructure protection and overseas interventions are considered. A brilliant analyst, Joseph provides an account of why it is that resilience has become such a popular policy topic and argues that resilience has risen to prominence because it fits with a particularly Anglo-Saxon and neoliberal form of governance. He discovers differing results across policy domains and national contexts, fomenting variations and tensions in the international discourse of resilience in policy-making.


Gerald Chan: Understanding China’s New Diplomacy: Silk Roads and Bullet Trains

In another monograph partly developed and written at the Centre, Gerald Chan assesses the important implications of ‘China’s new diplomacy’ for the global political economy. Chan discovers systemic sophistication. He dubs China’s strategic programme ‘geo-developmentism’, a new developmental path in the making, and critically and systematically addresses questions about China’s high-speed rail diplomacy with a special focus on the ‘one belt, one road’ initiative (OBOR). Chan also highlights the challenges the initiative poses to the state, particularly in balancing these projects to maintain China’s status as both a land and maritime power. By reviewing the country’s unique style of state capitalism and its success in absorbing foreign train technology, new developmental methods are revealed.

that the transnational field of migration management features a politics of expertise through which migration is enacted as a reality that can be managed according to certain policy preferences because it can be exactly known and quantified. The crucial point is that this enactment of migration as a precisely quantifiable and therefore manageable reality hinges on the production of ignorance about the known limits of quantifying migration. Thus, the article demonstrates that the production and circulation of ignorance is just as important as the production of knowledge for the enactment of intelligible objects of government.

The piece illustrates this intertwinement of knowledge and ignorance through a situated analysis of the “Global Migration Flows Interactive App” (GMFIA), a migration visualisation tool that is hosted by the International Organisation for Migration (IOM). The GMFIA is an interactive map which suggests users that the number of people migrating from country A to B can be exactly known at any point in time (see the screenshot above). However, this enactment of migration can only be sustained through the strategic production of ignorance about the known limits of quantifying migration.

One practice through which this production of ignorance is accomplished lies in the omission of a known issue of migration statistics: the inconsistency between the numbers of international migrants reported by different countries. In theory, each emigration event from a country should correspond to an immigration event in the receiving country. Yet, in practice the number of emigration events reported by sending countries are usually much lower than the respective number of immigrants reported by destination countries. For example, according to Eurostat figures, the UK reported 42,403 immigrants from Poland in 2015, while Poland reported sending only 11,682 emigrants to the UK. However, the GMFIA completely ignores this mismatch between recorded immigration and emigration events. If one compares the recorded emigration events of a given country, such as Poland, with the recorded immigration events of the corresponding destination country, such as the UK, the numbers match perfectly. This omission of one of the known limitations of migration statistics is achieved by simply equating the number of immigration events in a given destination country with the number of emigration events in the corresponding country of origin. This is one of the ways in which migration is enacted as a precisely measurable reality by the GMFIA. In this way the IOM’s ‘migration visualisation tool’ helps to secure one of the very doxa of the field of migration management i.e. that migration constitutes an intelligible, precisely measurable reality that can be ordered according to certain policy objectives.

Stephan Scheel, is Junior Professor for Transnational Cooperation and Migration Research at the University of Duisburg-Essen. He can be reached at stephan.scheel@uni-due.de.
Upcoming Events

**Defamation**
11 / 12
Käte Hamburger Dialogue
Resisting Online Defamation: Prospects for Global Cooperation

**Migration**
29 / 01
High skilled migration to Germany and Japan in comparative perspective with Gracia Liu Farrer (in cooperation with InZentIM and IN-EAST)

**Authority**
19 / 02
Käte Hamburger Lecture
Transnational Legal Encounters and the Politics of Protection with Tanja Aalbert

**Urban Utopia**
26 / 03
Käte Hamburger Dialogue
Migration and Urban Utopias (in cooperation with LAV)

**Annual Conference***
Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Global Cooperation Research
1st Annual Conference
8–10 April 2019

**Conference**
Counter-narratives to Regional Cooperation: Contesting European Union
13–14 May 2019
Jean Monnet Centre of Excellence for the Study of a Transnational Europe (CESTE) in Portsmouth and the Centre for Global Cooperation Research (GCR21)

**Governance**
08 / 04
Käte Hamburger Dialogue*
Roundtable on challenges for global governance

**Assemblage**
16 / 04
Käte Hamburger Lecture
Global Governance Assemblage in the Security Field with Rita Abrahamsen

**Populism**
tba / 05
Käte Hamburger Dialogue**
United against Globalism?
Populism and the De-legitimation of Global Cooperation


You are invited to follow our livestreams and share your thoughts with our team on Twitter.
Selected Publications

November 2018 (This list does not duplicate titles already announced in July, Newsletter 2/2018.)

What follows is a list of new publications of the Centre’s current and former fellows and staff as well as authors from our wider academic network. We publish an updated list and invite you to inform us about your recent contributions to the field of global cooperation research. The published list represents a selection of titles that we feel are substantive contributions to the field.


21 The ‘International Community’ as a Legal Notion
by Christian J. Tams
Duisburg 2018

20 The Resilience Turn in German Development Strategy and Humanitarian Intervention
by Jonathan Joseph
Duisburg 2017

19 From Inaction to Restrictions: Changes in Lebanon’s Policy Responses to Syrian Mass Refugee Movement
by Zeynep Şahin Mencütek
Duisburg 2017

18 Involvement and Impact of External Actors on Constitution Making in South Sudan and Somaliland: A Comparative Study
by Katrin Seidel
Duisburg 2017