Dear Readers,

Opening your newspaper, you can find nearly every day headlines that point towards challenges to multilateral global cooperation as we know it from the past decades. Global cooperation provides a patchy picture nowadays, characterized by contradictory and opposing developments. One way to address this multifaceted world of global cooperation is to study recent trends in different policy fields.

In this newsletter, contributions approach current trends in global cooperation in two policy fields studied at the Centre: climate change governance and internet governance. Franz Maulshagen, currently a fellow at the Centre, discusses recent findings on right-wing populism in Europe and the USA and its possible impact on climate and environmental policies (p. 2). While Maulshagen observes a lot of variation across countries and time, he also points towards claims for restoring national sovereignty as a major challenge for global cooperation on climate policy. Co-director Jan Aart Scholte, in an interview on p. 6, explains that non-governmental global governance of the internet is quite open to broad participation but that it also displays pronounced hierarchies of power. Still, its governance is ‘not created by any specific actors’ but instead by many hands.

In an upcoming event in December, a Käte Hamburger Dialogue on ‘Resisting Online Defamation: Prospects for Global Cooperation’ will expand our research agenda to questions of how internet content is being governed. This event will be livestreamed – so you can follow it wherever you are.

I wish you an exciting read.

Sigrid Quack
Director
Centre for Global Cooperation Research
Right-Wing Populisms and Climate Policy: A Recipe for Disaster

by Franz Mauelshagen

At the recent European Consortium for Political Research (ECPR) conference in Hamburg (August 22-25, 2018), several panels dealt with the societal acceptance of energy and climate policies. The recent rise of right-wing populism has raised doubts in particular about a consensus on anthropogenic climate change, its achievability and stability. Europe is no longer exempt. Climate change denialism has crossed the Atlantic and joined the populist mix with xenophobia, nationalism, and misogyny. The impact this has already had, and will have in the future, on climate and energy policies in Europe is hard to predict at this point. Right-wing populist parties (some with roots in neo-Nazism, e.g. the Sweden Democrats) have made significant gains in recent elections almost everywhere. They have become major opposition parties or even joined coalitions to share government, as is the case in Austria, Switzerland, Poland, Italy, and Hungary.

So far, right-wing populists have had little impact on European climate and energy policies. Rather than focussing on the European level, some of the studies presented at the ECPR looked into national climate and energy policies and worked with comparative approaches to assess the role played by strong right-wing parties so far. Some of the results were surprising at first glance. Preliminary findings of a comparative study on Norway, Denmark, Finland, Sweden, the Netherlands and Austria showed “that governments with far-right parties have proved to be equally and sometimes even more ambitious on climate and energy goals” than others. In some cases, parliaments overruled minority governments to implement ambitious climate and energy laws. One possible explanation considered by the authors was that nationalist parties in Europe do not assign first-rank priority to environmental issues. If true, this would make the European right wing look quite different from right-wing Republicans in the United States, who regard denying climate change and/or its anthropogenic causation as part of their political identity.

A study on Poland found that identifying environmental and climate protection policies with the political left was much more common among political parties and the government than among voters. The presenter, Adrian Wójcik from Nicolaus Copernicus University (Toruń), guessed that Polish voters lacked a tradition of left-right alignment that would allow them to identify Green policies as leftist. He conceded that Poland might also be special in that the Polish government considers potential energy dependence on Russian gas a most undesirable scenario. Generally speaking, a combination of the energy with the climate question makes the European map look much more diverse than it looks solely from the perspective of climate protection, or in comparison with the United States, which has had a powerful fossil resources extraction sector for more than a hundred years. The fossil energy
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Welcome Nina Schneider, Research Group Leader at the Centre!

Nina Schneider holds a PhD in History from the University of Essex. Previously, she coordinated the Research Area ‘Citizenship and Migration’ at the Global South Studies Center (GSSC) at the University of Cologne (2015–2018). She was a Visiting Scholar at Columbia University’s Institute for the Study of Human Rights (2012), Marie-Curie Fellow at the Zukunftskolleg, at the University of Konstanz (2013–2015), and Visiting Scholar the National University of Brasilia (UNB, 2015). Her interdisciplinary research focuses on the history of critical human and social rights in global perspective with a regional focus on Latin America (Brazil, Southern Cone) and the USA. She has published extensively in the field of Cold War dictatorships, transnational human rights movements, and post-authoritarian reckoning processes. Her current project—‘Global Child Labour Opponents and their Campaigns, 1890–1938’—focuses on early social rights governance in a global perspective.

Stephen Brown starts Project on LGBTI Rights in the Global South

Development aid expert and alumni fellow Stephen Brown has been awarded a grant from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada for his project ‘Foreign Aid and LGBTI Rights in the Global South: International and Local Dynamics’, 2018-2021. His research is now supported by a fellowship at the Netherlands Institute for Advanced Study. Stephen is based in Amsterdam from September 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019. Contact and further information at www.stephenbrown.xyz.

Manjiao Chi appointed Professor of International Law and Founding Director of CIELP, UIBE Law School, China

Manjiao Chi, alumni senior fellow of the Centre, was recently appointed professor of international law and founding director, Center of International Economic Law and Policy (CIELP), Law School, University of International Business and Economics (UIBE), Beijing. Manjiao was a senior fellow during 2014 and 2015, and contributed to the Center’s Routledge Book Series with his monograph ‘Integrating Sustainable Development in International Investment Law: Normative Incompatibility, System Integration and Governance Implications’ in 2017. His recent writings focus on China-EU and Asia-Pacific economic relations, and international trade and investment governance regimes reform. Manjiao was appointed consultant of international investment agreements (IIAs) by the United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (UNESCAP). He was commissioned to carry out a specialized study that examines all sustainable development provisions in 340 bilateral investment treaties (BITs) of Asian-Pacific LDCs and LLDCs. Manjiao presented the main findings in UNESCAP 8th FDI Network Meeting in Bangkok this September, and will further present in the World Investment Forum in Geneva this October.

Tamirace Fakhoury to Deliver Vienna Lecture on the European Union

Tamirace Fakhoury, a current fellow at the Centre (see an interview with Tamirace in our last newsletter issue), after visiting this year’s IPSA World Congress of Political Science in Brisbane, established research links with the Centre for Deliberative Democracy and Global Governance at the University of Canberra (Institute for Governance & Policy Analysis), an institution which has a common research agenda with the Centre in Duisburg. Tamirace was recently invited to deliver the Vienna Lecture on the European Union at the Institute for European Integration Research (EIF) of the University of Vienna. On 30 October she will speak about ‘Reforming the EUs Migration Policy: Debating perspectives from beyond the EUs borders’.
lobby, which has financed the “merchants of doubt” in the U.S., is not nearly as strong in Europe. European countries are net importers of energy. In this environment, concerns of national energy security and independence, held strongly among conservatives and right-wingers, work against fossil fuels, regardless of climate change.

That said, I doubt there is reason for optimism based on the above-mentioned studies. While climate change and other environmental concerns may rank low on the political agenda of right-wing parties in Europe, their claim to restore national sovereignty and autonomy (absurd as it may look from any other perspective) is programmatic hard core. Nationalist pressure on governments or right-wing government participation will make climate negotiations under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change even more tricky than they have become since the U.S. withdrew from the Paris Agreement. In the European Union, a potential conservative and right-wing majority may easily roll back emission targets, or single states might simply dismiss their commitments as non-binding.

And there is an even bigger elephant in the room. Current commitments on future emission reductions defined as nationally determined contributions (NDCs) under the Paris Agreement will be difficult to meet for any government in Europe without transforming private mobility. This will be particularly painful for economies with strong car-producing industries, which includes Germany and France, the pillars on which the European Union rests more than ever after Brexit. If the recent German emission scandal and the way car companies have handled it are indicative of the potential for cheating and denial, it is not implausible to expect that the automobile lobby could build an alliance with climate denialists and right-wing populists to mobilize customers against climate change mitigation. So far, national governments in Europe have done little to prepare voters for what to expect from climate politics if emission targets are to be taken seriously. As a strong believer in democracy I see no alternative to turning the transformation of private mobility into a matter of broad and continuous public debate.

At the start of his presentation, Adrian Wójcik showed a quote without telling the audience whom he was citing. The quote was a declaration of commitment to the mechanisms of international policy on issues of climate change and the environment from no other than Margaret Thatcher. Thatcher was no exception in the world of 1980s conservatism. Ronald Reagan, as 40th President of the U.S., supported the Montreal Protocol to protect the Ozone Layer and was even pushing for the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change to be established as an institution that included scientists as representatives of countries. George H. W. Bush, Reagan’s successor, at the Paris economic summit in July 1988 positioned himself as a leader on global environmental issues. Of course, neither Reagan nor Bush senior were right-wing nationalists of the type we are seeing today. What strikes me is the difference between their Republican governments and the Republican opposition to climate change policies in our day. What has been lost along the way is commitment to international treaties and confidence in scientific knowledge, on which the modern world has been built. Right-wing populism seeks to replace those values permanently by a culture of nationalist egotism denying the principles of responsibility and solidarity among the community of nations. In the world we live in, that is a recipe for disaster.

* * *

The author is a current fellow at the Centre. He can be reached at mauelshagen@gcr21.uni-due.de.
Andreas Thiel at Workshop on Climate Change Adaptation and Water Governance in (ever transforming) Uzbekistan

In August, Andreas Thiel met a series of highly motivated and engaged academics and NGOs in the fields of agrarian climate change adaptation and water studies in Uzbekistan. The trip was part of a research project funded by the German Ministry of Research and Education that is led by the Leibniz-Zentrum für Agrarlandschaftsforschung (ZALF) e. V. The project addresses ways to overcome problems of salinization, related to drought and water overuse in the country, through green technologies. As core aspect of the project, governance issues were discussed relating to acceptance, policies and ways of organizing the implementation of innovative ways and technologies to adapt water use to climate change. Furthermore, the trip served as an exchange with a variety of higher education and teaching organizations in the country. The most remarkable features were the hospitality shown, the openness to social science approaches to governance and education oriented by Western ideals. Recently, a new president took over power in Uzbekistan. Throughout his first year in office, he created a sense of positive change and opening up across the country – no doubt this makes for a promising context of collaboration among European and Uzbek higher education and research organizations in a way that will accompany the transformations initiated in the future.

ECPR Participation

Members of the Centre’s research groups broached issues of global governance at this years’ ECPR General Conference in Hamburg. The Centre’s director Sigrid Quack organized and chaired the panel ‘Between Fragmentation and Cooperation: Towards a Comparative Analysis of Trajectories of Transnational Governance Fields’. Research fellows Micheline van Riemsdijk and Franz Maulshagen, as well as Katja Freistein who co-leads the Centre’s research group on ‘pathways and mechanisms of global cooperation’, and the Centre’s co-director Jan Aart Scholte contributed to different panels of this conference. In discussing the complexity of governance, they touched upon diverse issues such as the global compacts on migration, climate change governance from a history of science perspective or the automation of quantified knowledge in international development organisations and ‘Old and New Authorities in Internet Governance’. Sigrid Quack’s own presentation summed it up in a way, arguing that a comparative analysis of pathways and polycentric forms of global cooperation will not only provide us with a much richer understanding of the underlying mechanisms of the dynamics of authority relations beyond the nation-state but also reveal a much more complex and diverse landscape than the often too bipolar debates on fragmentation and integration suggest.

Obituary: Lily Ling

With great sorrow the Centre received news that Lily Ling passed away on 1 October. Professor Ling impressed many scholars of quite different backgrounds at our Conference last November in Duisburg with her talk on 'THIRDNESS: Epistemic Compassion for World Politics' and with her kind and as well straightforward presence in numerous discussions. A vivid dialogue with Professor Jonathan Joseph at the very end of the conference, taped in the lobby of the venue and published online, still gives a sense of her special if not unique way to put things into perspective. It is with sorrow and gratefulness that we remember her.
Interview with Jan Aart Scholte about Internet Governance, Democratic Participation and the Language of the Game

What motivated the Centre to focus on Internet Governance as one of its four policy fields?

Three reasons come to mind. First, the Centre is concerned with global cooperation, and the Internet is quintessentially global. This worldwide communication network inherently needs major elements of global cooperation in order to operate. Second, the Internet is new. Other global issues such as finance and health have a longer history that predates contemporary accelerated globalisation. So they bring older ideas, practices and institutions into today’s more global world. In contrast, the Internet does not have such historical baggage. So it may allow us to see what global governance looks like when built from scratch in the twenty-first century. Third, global governance of the Internet is striking for its degree of privatisation. Global-scale regulation of the Internet is conducted mainly through business, civil society, engineers, and academic researchers. States are generally in a backseat, if they are present at all. So the Internet is a good case of nongovernmental global governance.

You speak of three layers of the internet to be studied. What do you mean by that?

At the Centre we make a threefold distinction between hard infrastructure, virtual infrastructure, and content. The hard infrastructure includes the cables, the switching points, the devices that connect to the Internet, and so on. Less known and less visible perhaps is the virtual infrastructure, which consists of the domain name system, the Internet Protocol (IP) regime of numerical addresses, and the protocol parameters, that is, the technical standards that allow data to be transmitted on the Internet. And then you have the content, which is the data which flows through the Internet. Global cooperation is probably most strongly required in relation to the virtual infrastructure. Rules regarding content are much more territorial and involve much more action by states. For example, one government may decide that it doesn’t want to have certain material on YouTube within its territory and then it can block that. But a state cannot unilaterally decide what domain names are going to be called or how IP addresses are going to be allocated. Such tasks require global cooperation at their core.

The Internet from its beginning was associated with ideas of a non-hierarchical communication medium. Does this idea of equality and horizontality still play a role in Internet governance today?

Global Internet governance is quite open to broad participation. People from all regions and all sectors of society are involved. However, it would be wrong to say that everyone has equal possibilities to participate in bodies like the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) and the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). There are pronounced hierarchies of power, with strong advantages for wealthier people, English speakers, men, and other socially privileged groups.

You recently scrutinized the IANA transition in 2014-2016. What turned out to be significant?

The so-called IANA stewardship transition was the process of withdrawing unilateral formal US government control of the virtual infrastructure of the Internet. There had been a gradual retreat of direct US influence in this field since 1998, but the transition in 2014–16 marked the end of legal US government control of Internet names, numbers and protocols. Of course power is not as simple and straightforward as legal formalities. Yes, the US government is now formally just one of 170 member states in ICANN’s Government Advisory Committee. However, in other ways the US government is still quite strong in the global Internet regime. Moreover, as a country, too, the US remains in very strong position. For example, US-based companies are by far the strongest commercial force in the governance of virtual Internet infrastructure. US-based civil society groups are among the strongest non-governmental organisations. US-based engineers are disproportionately...
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influential in this area. The key signing ceremony to ensure integrity of the domain name system is conducted in the United States. The root zone file, at the heart of the domain name systems, is administered by Verisign, a US-based company with headquarters outside Washington, DC.

What does this mean in relation to post-IANA transition governing arrangements?

US-based actors are in a disproportionately powerful position in global governance of virtual internet infrastructure. But they are by no means all-controlling. They could not operate without the involvement of wider so-called ‘multi-stakeholder community’. That community is anything but exclusively US. It has very strong European components and significant inputs also from Latin America, Africa, Asia-Pacific, and Middle East.

But isn’t it all just about technical details? Should we not just let the engineers get on with their jobs without bringing politics into it?

Certainly the scientific and technical participants in global Internet governance prefer to present themselves as apolitical actors. For example, they have deliberately kept the technical advisory committees outside the more politicized processes at ICANN. Nevertheless, the advice of these committees can have significant political implications. Likewise, the technical decisions of the Internet Engineering Task Force, where Internet protocols are largely developed, have important political consequences, e.g. for civil rights, for intellectual property, etc. The pretence that science can be apolitical fails in the Internet area as much as in the climate, finance and health areas.

And what about economics?

As we discussed before, business is a big player in global Internet governance. Indeed, the main technical people involved are in most cases employees of large companies. It may sound cliché to say that the Internet is ruled by capitalism, but it is important to recall that it was not always so. The virtual infrastructure of the Internet was largely a profit-free zone until the mid-1990s. Since then the Internet has become big business, and commercial forces have come to have major interests in the domain name system, the protocols, and even the allocation of IP addresses. Today it is highly unlikely that bodies such as ICANN will enact rules that go against the wishes of the Internet industry. The word ‘capitalism’ is hardly heard in these quarters, but it is an unspoken overarching rule of the game.

The Internet accelerates many procedures and organizational aspects of trans-border trade and finance, for example. Does it also accelerate the change of rules?

Absolutely. The rules and regulatory processes around virtual Internet infrastructure have changed very rapidly over the past several decades. At the same time, because of the Internet’s involvement in so many other areas of governance, they experience accelerated change as well.

Rapid change brings challenges for democracy: how to make sure that the changing arrangements do not escape public participation and control? These concerns are reflected in endless debates and institutional reforms around the issue of ‘accountability’ in global Internet governance.

Would you like to say a word about the upcoming dialogue about Internet governance at the Centre? What will be the topic and what about the motivation to choose that topic?

The Centre from time to time holds public meetings to discuss burning policy questions around global cooperation. On December 11th we will host a panel to debate how far and in what ways so-called ‘hate speech’ on the Internet should be regulated. Should governments clamp down on defamatory online content? Or should freedom of speech prevail regardless of what is said? It should be a highly provocative discussion!

* * *

11th Käte Hamburger Dialogue
11th December 2018

Resisting Online Defamation: Prospects for Global Cooperation

An international and interdisciplinary panel considers both the possibilities and the constraints for sustained and impactful supranational collaboration against hate speech.

With Daniëlle Flonk, Blayne Haggart, Sigrid Quack, Jan Aart Scholte and Natasha Tusikov

Please check p. 11 for detailed information.

Interview with Jan Aart Scholte - continued

In 2018–2020, Jan Aart Scholte, alongside his co-directorship at the Centre, coordinates a project on ‘Legitimacy outside the State: Governing the Global Internet’, funded by the Swedish Research Council.

* IANA = Internet Assigned Numbers Authority
WGBU: Just & In-Time Climate Policy
How can climate policy be designed in a fair and modern way? This policy paper, published by the German Advisory Council on Global Change (WGBU), proposes four far-reaching and innovative initiatives for a fair transformation. Amongst them are a climate passport for people forced to leave their homes due to climate change or legal support for people harmed by climate change. The German Advisory Council on Global Change (WGBU) is co-chaired by Prof. Dr Dirk Messner, who also co-directs the Käte Hamburger Kolleg. Time will tell whether the Federal Government will accept the advice of the WGBU, its scientific advisory body, and will work towards a socially just shaping of climate change.


Urs Luterbacher and Detlef F. Sprinz: Global Climate Policy
Aiming towards gathering what political scientists and related social sciences can contribute to better understand the international response to global climate change, this volume provides an analysis of the international climate change regime and considers the challenges of maintaining current structures and the possibilities for creating new forms of international cooperation. The book is edited by Prof. Dr Sprinz, alumni senior fellow at the Käte Hamburger Kolleg and Urs Lauterbacher, Professor Emeritus at the University of Geneva.


Holger Niemann: The Justification of Responsibility in the UN Security Council
Connecting research on norms and legitimacy in international relations with pragmatist sociology, Holger Niemann offers a fresh perspective on the often criticised incoherent decision-making processes within the UN Security Council. Rather than perceiving the normative controversies of the UNSC’s proceedings as a problem, Niemann demonstrates their crucial role for the constitution and maintenance of order in the Security Council. His excellent contribution to the Centre’s Global Cooperation series provides an account of the complexities and inconsistencies of decision-making processes and their normative foundations in international organisations.


Sam White, Christian Pfister and Franz Mauelshagen: The Palgrave Handbook of Climate History
Co-edited by the Centre’s research fellow Dr Franz Mauelshagen this first comprehensive, state-of-the-field guide to past weather and climate and their role in human societies brings together dozens of international specialists from the sciences and humanities in order to describe the methods, sources, and major findings of historical climate reconstruction and impact research.

Reviews

Jonas Tallberg, Karin Bäckstrand and Jan Aart Scholte (eds.): Legitimacy in Global Governance: Sources, Processes, and Consequences
Edited by the Stockholm University Professors, Jonas Tallberg, Karin Bäckstrand and Jan Aart Scholte, this comprehensive volume develops an agenda for systematic and comparative research on legitimacy in global governance. Addressing different aspects of the overarching question: whether, why, how, and with what consequences global governance institutions gain, sustain, and lose legitimacy, this volume provides a sound understanding of the working of legitimacy in global governance institutions. The volume, which is co-edited by the Centre’s co-director Jan Aart Scholte also features a chapter by alumni senior fellow Fariborz Zelli on the effects of legitimacy crises in complex global governance.


Thomas G. Weiss and Rorden Wilkinson (eds.): International Organization and Global Governance
Completely revised and updated for the second edition, this textbook compilation by Weiss and Wilkinson continues to offer a state of the art resource available for all interested in international organization and global governance. Contributions from well-known experts in the field include David Held, Ramesh Thakur, Andrew F. Cooper, Suzan Sell, L.H.M.Ling and not least Jan Aart Scholte. International Organization and Global Governance is a self-contained resource enabling readers to comprehend more fully the role of myriad actors in the governance of global life as well as to assemble the many pieces of the contemporary global governance puzzle.


Deepshikha Shahi: Advaita as a Global International Relations Theory
The academic discipline of International Relations strives to attain a ‘global’ spirit to narrow the cognitive gaps between the West and the Rest. On the one hand, there is the hegemonic presence of mainstream universalist Eurocentric IR theories, and on the other the counter-hegemonic presence of particularist Post-colonial and De-colonial non-Eurocentric IR theories. This book uses the monist schema of ‘subject-object merger’ in the ancient Indian philosophy of Advaita to inaugurate a Global IR theory. In the global theoretical schema of Advaitic monism, the apparent particularist reality is supplemented (not contradicted) with the hidden universalist reality – the net result of which is a reconciliation of dualism with monism at the theoretical-practical level. The possibilities of this reconciliation have not been estimated at either level and as such, this untapped intellectual strategy stands to enrich both Eurocentric and non-Eurocentric IR. Deepshikha, alumni fellow of the Centre, establishes Advaita as an alternative epistemological tool to re-imagine the complex realities of contemporary international politics.

Upcoming Event

11th Käte Hamburger Dialogue
Resisting Online Defamation: Prospects for Global Cooperation

11 December 2018
6 p.m. – 7:30 p.m. (Livestream)
NETZ – NanoEnergieTechnikZentrum
University of Duisburg-Essen, Campus Duisburg
Carl-Benz-Str. 199, 47057 Duisburg

For all of its benefits, the Internet has also created large global public cyber-spaces for the spread of defamation. Burgeoning online hate speech – verbal degradation and humiliation of other individuals and groups – deeply undermines public discourse. Given that online defamation spreads with little heed of territorial borders, it becomes an issue for global cooperation. At the same time, global cooperation against hate speech (among governments, commercial Internet services, and civil society associations) faces particular challenges. After all, different parties around the world have widely varying approaches to the issue: in their historical experiences, legal frameworks, political cultures, and institutional arrangements.

Against this backdrop Käte Hamburger Kolleg/Centre for Global Cooperation Research (KHK/GCR21) convenes this Dialogue to explore the prospects for global cooperation around resistance to online defamation. An international and interdisciplinary panel considers both the possibilities and the constraints for sustained and impactful supranational collaboration against hate speech.

Welcoming and Introductory Remarks
Prof. Dr Jan Aart Scholte, Co-Director of the Käte Hamburger Kolleg and Professor in Peace and Development, University of Gothenburg,

Panellists
Daniëlle Flonk (M.A.), Research Associate to the project ‘Evolving Internet Interfaces: Content Control and Privacy Protection’, Hertie School of Governance, Berlin
Dr Blayne Haggart, Associate Professor, Department of Political Science, Brock University, Canada/ Research Fellow at the Käte Hamburger Kolleg
Dr Natasha Tusikov, Assistant Professor in Criminology, York University, Canada

Moderator
Prof. Dr Sigrid Quack, Director of the Käte Hamburger Kolleg and Professor of Sociology, University of Duisburg-Essen
Research Agenda
A detailed elaboration of the Centre’s research agenda is available on the Centre’s website:
www.gcr21.org > research