Dear Readers,

It is with great pleasure that I introduce to you the first issue of the Centre for Global Cooperation Research’s freshly designed and expanded quarterly newsletter, now labelled ‘Global Cooperation Research – A Quarterly Magazine’. Besides news and reports from the Centre, it draws more closely on the actual research at the Centre and includes a special section on a current policy issue relevant for cooperation research.

In two sections, both of the Centre’s research groups, ‘Pathways and Mechanisms of Global Cooperation’ as well as ‘Global Cooperation and Polycentric Governance’ sketch out their research agenda for the first three-year sequence of the funding period (2018–2021) and highlight selected individual research projects by fellows in the respective research groups.

The Centre’s first annual conference on ‘Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Global Cooperation Research’ will bring together researchers from different faculties and research centres at the University of Duisburg-Essen and aims to highlight the multidisciplinary and multifaceted research on (global) cooperation done at our university. Please find the exciting conference programme on pages 9 and 10.

This issue’s Special is an interview with Wolfram Kaiser (Professor of European Studies at the University of Portsmouth, UK and Senior Fellow at the Centre from June 2019) who explains that the EU’s inventiveness in the application of rules might help to avoid a hard Brexit and to agree on the future relationship between the EU and the UK.

Also have a look at our fellow and alumni news, workshop reports and upcoming events as well as reviews on recent publications. Last but not least, don’t miss to visit our relaunched and refreshed website and stay tuned!

I wish you a good start into the summer term!

Matthias Schuler
Executive Director
Pathways and Mechanisms of Global Cooperation: How Imaginaries Shape Collaboration

By Katja Freistein, Bettina Mahlert, Sigrid Quack, and Christine Unrau

What kinds of processes foster or hinder cooperation over time? What alternative pathways exist that may enable or hinder cooperation on common problems of global scale? What mechanisms foster or hinder global cooperation? How do imaginaries of such pathways shape the process of global cooperation itself?

The Centre explores these questions in 2018-2020 from theoretical, empirical and methodological perspectives encompassing research from climate change, peacebuilding, internet, migration governance and other policy fields. The research group is coordinated by Senior Research Fellows Katja Freistein and Christine Unrau together with Co-Director Dirk Messner and Director Sigrid Quack.

The Centre’s research on pathways and mechanisms of global cooperation is motivated by three interrelated developments in global cooperation that have recently stimulated academic interest in the temporal dimension of global governance.

**Stalemate.** Recently we have witnessed re-nationalization moves against multilateral arrangements by state leaders such as Donald Trump and Viktor Orban. To many observers, these withdrawals are only the tip of the iceberg – symptoms of a deeper crisis of multilateralism. While the number of international institutions steadily grew since World War II, this growth has now come to a standstill. Furthermore, the failure to open the United Nations Security Council to include more permanent members illustrates the resistance of international organizations to reform. The perception of ‘gridlock’ in global governance has stimulated academic interest in the temporal dimension of global governance.

**Pluralization.** While scholars are looking for alternative cooperation pathways, global cooperation is already becoming increasingly pluralistic. Not only companies, civil society organizations, public-private partnerships and other non-state actors, but also sub-state entities like municipalities, are entering into negotiations and institution-building directed towards the tragedy of the global commons. While classical international law in the form of treaty-making is stagnating, so-called informal forms of law-making are proliferating. This implies that more and diverse actors are bringing in their perspectives on desirable developments of global cooperation and that global governance is often seen taking polycentric and polyarchic forms.

**Politicization.** The rise of right- and left-wing anti-globalist coalitions that frame their opposition towards globalization either along economic or cultural logics raises challenges for global cooperation. Whether cooperation is possible then is no longer just a question of the balance of forces between great powers, but much more a question of support by national audiences. The backpedaling of German political elites from the original welcoming culture and the EU’s difficulties in dealing with migration demonstrate that the success of cross-border cooperation depends on the perceptions and identity of relevant audiences and actors. When relevant actors change their perceptions, the pathways of cooperation will change as well.

This is where the research group’s current work, which will lead to the publication of a volume edited by the authors of this article, starts off from. Our interest relates to the ideas and perceptions that are involved in different pathways of global cooperation. More specifically, we scrutinize the meaning that is attached to the past, present, and future by the cooperating ac-
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of transition that these imaginaries contain: while some transitions are imagined as incremental processes of learning, others involve critical junctures, tipping points, or catastrophe. We argue that these varieties have very concrete consequences for processes of cooperation. For example, when catastrophe is imagined as imminent, this may lead to fatalism, while the expectation of tipping points may intensify the urgency of action – and in some cases even lead to an exaggerated sense of entitlement to take decisions. This in turn has effects on the processes of mobilization and cooperation.

'Narrating pathways'. We examine the modes in which visions of pathways are articulated. Pathways of global cooperation can be expressed in declarations and legal documents which construct their own temporal context by inscribing themselves in a long history of global events, starting with the UN charter or the declaration of human rights. Other modes of generating visions of pathways can be utopian or dystopian fiction, documentary films or scientifi c future scenarios based on numeric calculations. Another decisive source of imagined pathways is faith: the holy texts of world religions contain conceptions of a global community of the faithful and visions of directionality in history. We are specifically interested in the different concepts of transition that these imaginaries contain: while some transitions are imagined as incremental processes of learning, others involve critical junctures, tipping points, or catastrophe. We argue that these varieties have very concrete consequences for processes of cooperation. For example, when catastrophe is imagined as imminent, this may lead to fatalism, while the expectation of tipping points may intensify the urgency of action – and in some cases even lead to an exaggerated sense of entitlement to take decisions. This in turn has effects on the processes of mobilization and cooperation.

'Narrating pathways'. We examine the modes in which visions of pathways are articulated. Pathways of global cooperation can be expressed in declarations and legal documents which construct their own temporal context by inscribing themselves in a long history of global events, starting with the UN charter or the declaration of human rights. Other modes of generating visions of pathways can be utopian or dystopian fiction, documentary films or scientifi c future scenarios based on numeric calculations. Another decisive source of imagined pathways is faith: the holy texts of world religions contain conceptions of a global community of the faithful and visions of directionality in history. We are specifically interested in the different concepts of transition that these imaginaries contain: while some transitions are imagined as incremental processes of learning, others involve critical junctures, tipping points, or catastrophe. We argue that these varieties have very concrete consequences for processes of cooperation. For example, when catastrophe is imagined as imminent, this may lead to fatalism, while the expectation of tipping points may intensify the urgency of action – and in some cases even lead to an exaggerated sense of entitlement to take decisions. This in turn has effects on the processes of mobilization and cooperation.
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The authors are members of the research group on 'Path-
ways and Mechanisms of Global Cooperation' at the Centre.
Futuring by Numbers: Quantified Imaginaries of Change in the Development Field

Bettina Mahlert

In recent years, we have witnessed various kinds of ‘numbers’ proliferating in global governance. Global rankings now abound in transnational and global policy fields – ranging from the UNDP’s Human Development Index and Transparency International’s Corruption Perception Index, to credit ratings of states provided by private agencies like Fitch and Moody’s. Furthermore, the implementation of the Paris Agreement on Climate Change and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) are monitored via the use of numbers. The SDGs’ global indicator framework alone contains 232 indicators that will be accomplished by national indicators.

My research focuses on the different ways in which the future is imagined through numbers and how this shapes the respective cooperation processes. In doing so, I take the field of development as my example. So far, I have identified three different modes of imagining futures within international development.

Desirable futures: Indicators like national income or life expectancy are widely used as measures of progress. Through translating the overall vision of ‘enhancing human well-being’ into more concrete goals – e.g. ‘rising school enrollment rates’ – , development indicators enable policy makers to identify policies and thus act upon the global goals. At the same time, though indicators help define goals, they also abstract from the means of achieving them. This obscures the highly unequal access to resources. Quite unrealistically, global rankings depict ‘rich’ and ‘poor’ countries as if they would be competing equals on a level playing field.

Probable futures: Prognoses calculate probable pathways into the future – futures that will come about if certain conditions hold. These projections are often communicated as alerts, for example, through warnings of global overpopulation or of a future climate catastrophe. The commitment of states to keep climate warming below 1.5C demonstrates the sense of urgency that the numerical prognoses by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) have created.

Possible futures: Scenarios, of which the IPCC’s emission pathways are the best-known examples, project different possible pathways into the future. What is particular to them is that they are very practice-oriented. Policymakers are involved in the scenario-crafting, and the primary goal is to open up their mindset – enable them imagine futures in a different way that they habitually do. The success of the scenarios does not depend on one of the envisioned pathways becoming true, but rather on the possibility of the scenarios to enhance the ability of policy-makers to reflect and understand processes of cooperation, their effects, their limits and potentials, and thus enable them to ultimately take better decisions.

Bettina Mahlert is a research fellow at the Centre. She can be reached at bmahlert@soziologie.rwth-aachen.de.

A Critical Analysis of Cooperative Approaches to Climate Change Mitigation under Article 6 of the Paris Agreement

Ying Shen

While the global climate regime has encountered a gridlock since the failure of the Kyoto Protocol, the Paris Agreement appears to break such a deadlock through a series of cooperative approaches beyond the Kyoto Protocol. After a long-lasting negotiation on voluntary cooperation, the parties agreed upon the text of Article 6 of the Paris Agreement at the very end of the 21st session of the Conference of the Parties. To encourage most entities – national or sub-national, public or private – to participate in international cooperation on climate change to the highest extent, Article 6 of the Paris Agreement sets out several routes through which countries may wish to voluntarily cooperate in implementing their nationally determined contributions. It encompasses a wide range of cooperative approaches, including both market-based and non-market approaches, and can be governed in either a bottom-up or a top-down manner.

This project is conducted in this context, and it aims to analyze these cooperative approaches to climate change mitigation under Article 6 of the Paris Agreement. It firstly uses the method of doctrinal legal research to investigate and elaborate on the three tangibly different approaches to this international
cooperation – i.e., the cooperative approaches under Article 6.2 and 6.3, the UNFCCC-governed crediting mechanism under Article 6.4 and 6.7, and the framework for non-market approaches under Article 6.8 and 6.9. Following from this, the project undertakes an analysis of the implications of Article 6 on international climate cooperation along four dimensions – i.e., centralized governance vs. decentralized governance, precision vs. ambiguity, uniformity vs. differentiation, and legally binding obligations vs. non-legally binding provisions. This project finds that global cooperation through international treaties is to some extent like a ‘rubber band’ that functions within a certain range of legally binding obligations. It is imagined that, taking no account of other factors, the pathway of global cooperation affected by legally binding obligations is like an inverted U-curve in a coordinate system, where the horizontal axis stands for the binding nature of the Agreement and the vertical axis stands for the degree of cooperation. Taking other factors into account, curves illustrating the pathways of cooperation may be presented in various forms where the tipping points may exist at different positions. Degrees of complexity illustrated by the curves will thus reflect the extent to which the pathways of global cooperation are complex.

Ying Shen was a research fellow at the Centre. She can be reached at stefanie.sheny@gmail.com.

Take Two Practices of Repetition Across International Law

Wouter Werner

Wednesday February 8, 2017. The Atlantic Council, in cooperation with the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs, launches the so-called ‘Tallinn Manual 2.0’. The Manual is meant to explicate how existing international law is to be applied to cyber-operations. On the same day, the UN Security Council adopts Resolution 2340 (2017), extending the mandate for the expert panel monitoring sanctions in Darfur, Sudan. The operative part of the Resolution is preceded by a Preamble, which recalls earlier resolutions and reports, while reaffirming existing rules of international law and prior commitments to the peace process in Sudan. February 8th is also a day of preparation for hundreds of international law students across the world. In April of the same year, the final rounds of the Jessup international moot court competition will be held in Washington and across the globe law schools hope their teams will be selected and perform well.

However different these examples may be, they have one thing in common: they all revolve around acts of repetition. The Tallinn Manual is a restatement of existing law, the Security Council recalls and reiterates existing obligations and students rehearse the law. International law exists in and through the ways in which it is repeated. Its role in global cooperation, therefore, can only be grasped if one has a good understanding of what these practices of repetition entail.

My project at the Centre focused on six practices of repetition across international law, varying from the emergence of customary law, decision-making in the Security Council, academic writing, and teaching in international law to cinematic representations of international law. In each case, I studied how acts of repetition assign authorship and authority, how they relate the past, present and the future and how they foster new readings of international law.

Wouter Werner was a research fellow at the Centre. He can be reached at w.g.werner@vu.nl.
Global Cooperation and Polycentric Governance

By Philipp Michaelis and Jan Aart Scholte

Introduction

Migration flows: what, if anything, is regulating the mess? Climate change: how is it being (mis)managed, by whom, and why? Global Internet: who is ruling it? Peacebuilding: how to advance the process when, so it seems, everyone is involved and no one is in charge? Such pressing questions of global cooperation motivate the Centre’s interest in what we call ‘polycentric governance’. The term ‘polycentrism’ refers here to a situation where ‘many centres’ do policymaking. Today a global problem tends to be addressed not in one place (such as the nation-state), but at multiple sites spread across several geographical scales and different social sectors.

For example, a financial crisis can attract regulatory attention from economic ministries and central banks of various governments, plus European institutions at a regional level, plus the Financial Stability Board, the Group of Seven, and the International Monetary Fund at a global level, plus nongovernmental bodies such as the Group of Thirty and the International Capital Markets Association. How do these many bodies interlink and handle (or fail to handle) the situation? Polycentric governance raises major questions about policy coordination and effectiveness, about democracy and accountability, and about fairness. What kinds of global cooperation are possible under conditions of polycentrism? The Centre explores this question in 2018-2021 from three interrelated angles: theoretical, empirical, and evaluative. The work is coordinated by Senior Research Fellows Frank Gadinger and Nina Schneider together with Co-Directors Tobias Debiel and Jan Aart Scholte.

Theorising polycentric governing

During 2018-19 the Centre is especially concerned to explore concepts and frameworks of analysis in respect of polycentrism. Recent years have seen a proliferation of novel theories and perspectives that seek to understand the complex regulatory dynamics of today’s rapidly changing world. The Centre is bringing together scholars from a variety of academic disciplines to undertake a critical collective examination of these new ideas.

Theories of polycentric governing can be loosely grouped into ‘institutional’, ‘socio-legal’, ‘structural’, and ‘relational’ approaches. Institutional theories emphasize the role of organisational networks in contemporary governance. Socio-legal perspectives focus on the plurality of laws and law-like mechanisms that order society today. Structural approaches highlight the importance of underlying ordering patterns, such as capitalism or patriarchy. Relational understandings of polycentrism stress practices: the repetitive everyday routines that give shape to governing. Of course, this division into four approaches is overly neat, and in practice many studies of polycentrism combine elements from these different perspectives.

Staff, fellows and other guest researchers are collaborating at the Centre to interrogate these diverse theories. In particular we look at techniques (how poly-
Polycentric governing is done), power (what forces make polycentric governing happen the ways that it does), and legitimacy (how polycentric governing is approved – or resisted). To explore these issues, several workshops in Duisburg (October 2018 and March 2019) have assembled scholars from Germany and abroad in the fields of comparative literature, history, international relations, law, political science, and sociology.

The KHK/GCR21 itself does not favour one or the other theoretical account of polycentric governance. The Centre is open to a full spectrum of perspectives and in particular aims to encourage dialogue among the different views. Knowledge of polycentric governance has arguably suffered to date when researchers who respectively take institutional, socio-legal, structural or relational approaches have worked mainly in isolation. The Centre can bring the various lines of thinking on polycentric governance into conversation, with a resulting enrichment of knowledge for all.

Participants in this conversation include two KHK fellows (Andreas Thiel and Tamirace Fakhoury) whose research projects related to polycentric governance are introduced later in this magazine. Other contributors include Frida Beckman (Stockholm University), Alejandro Esguerra (Bielefeld University), Alexis Galán (Goethe University Frankfurt), Rosalba Icaza Garza (International Institute of Social Studies), Marianne Marchand (Universidad de las Américas), Henk Overbeek (Free University of Amsterdam), Philip Liste (GCR21 Fellow), Jothie Rajah (American Bar Foundation), Adam Sandor (GCR21 Fellow), Fariborz Zelli (Lund University), and Sigrid Quack (GCR21 Director).

A book resulting from these endeavours, edited by Frank Gadinger and Jan Aart Scholte, is expected to be published in 2020.

Future research on polycentric governance

At the same time that the Centre’s work on theorising polycentric governance advances, the group is in 2019-2020 also turning to a more empirical phase of research. These investigations look at the concrete workings of complex regulatory arrangements in global cooperation today. Particular attention is given to the Centre’s four main policy fields: climate change, Internet governance, migration, and peace-building. New research fellows are arriving in early and mid-2019 to collaborate with Centre staff on these issues.

Looking further ahead, the Centre will in 2020-2021 focus more on the consequences of polycentric governance for the extent, character, and outcomes of global cooperation. How does polycentrism affect the degree to which global cooperation is realized (or not)? How does polycentric governance influence the types and forms of global cooperation that occur (or not)? And what implications does polycentric governance have for the results of global cooperation, for example, in terms of problem-solving, participation, and the distribution of costs and benefits?

The authors are members of the research group on ‘Polycentric Governance’ at the Centre.
Polycentricity as a Research Tool in the EU-Arab Space: the Case of Refugee Politics

Tamirace Fakhoury

The notions of polycentricity and polycentric governance have elicited much attention in various policy fields such as internet, climate and environmental governance. Various strands of literature have debated the usefulness of such notions when it comes to describing forms of collaboration and fragmentation in multi-level settings in which action is required at local, national and international levels.

Such notions have however been less popular in the literature on migration governance, though migratory dynamics generate both policy coordination and friction across various sites of authority. Additionally, the conceptual tool of polycentricity has so far been only marginally used to describe complex nodes of power between the EU and its Arab neighbours. Experts have mainly drawn on the dominant literature problematizing the EU’s external relations framework and its implications for cooperation and conflict in the Euro-Arab transregional space.

In my project on the EU-Arab transregional refugee regimes, I adopted the notion of polycentricity as an analytical tool to (1) map colliding terrains of meaning and power between the EU and Arab refugee hosting states and (2) to show how Arab states have shaped the EU’s external governance capacity. With regard to Syria’s displacement crisis, the EU deepened its partnership with refugee hosting states such as Jordan and Lebanon, two key states of arrival. In this context, it has developed new tools of refugee governance that it frames as ‘innovative’ and capable of boosting resilience and stabilization. Examples thereof are regional trust funds and compacts. Nevertheless, when assessing such politics of collaboration on the refugee question, there is more to it than meets the eye. Arab states have not been passive followers of the EU’s policy prescriptions. Rather, they have in various ways shaped the EU’s policy frame. Examples of this revolve around leveraging its refugee assistance for strategic ends or contesting its policy solutions for the region in a context marked by unequal burden sharing. With respect to this, I have tracked local discourses of contestation, showing how they have impacted the EU’s policy delivery. I have also explored how security practices have fed into each other on both sides of the Mediterranean. For instance, the EU’s politics of refugee securitization within its own borders have had transregional effects, shaping the discourse of Arab governments and their readiness to reform their asylum regimes. From yet another perspective, endemic constraints in refugee hosting states have in various ways widened the rift between the EU’s intended policy tools and their outputs on the ground.

Against this backdrop, looking at the interactions between the EU’s and Syria’s neighbours through the lens of polycentricity has allowed me to account for the policy cycle that the EU’s external actions go through: The EU’s external tools are reshaped as they travel through a field marked by divergences.

Drawing on the lens of polycentricity is promising not only for charting the complex terrain of refugee governance but also for understanding how transregional discourses and practices feed into each other in the Euro-Arab space. Such perspectives inspire new research terrains that the literature focusing on the EU’s external relations with the Arab region can only address in limited perspectives. By adopting the lens of polycentricity, one is compelled to ask new questions and to reformulate older ones. The question as to how the EU’s external refugee governance capacity impacts refugee rights and refugee hosting states is still crucial. Further, new research angles such as Arab states’ strategic leveraging of the EU’s refugee aid, or the pathways they use to contest the EU’s policy frame have been gaining importance. In this regard, the tool of polycentricity allows for the tracking of how norm fragmentation and ‘push and pull’ dynamics influence the making and (un)making of refugee politics in the Euro-Arab space. It also generates insights into how the EU’s external framework interacts with local settings, morphing at times into a ‘different beast’.

From a yet more optimistic perspective, the lens of polycentricity offers a chance to study how opportunities for learning and improving inclusiveness on both sides of the Mediterranean could be achieved.

Tamirace Fakhoury is a research fellow at the Centre. She can be reached at tamirace.fakhoury@lau.edu.lb.
Transnational Organic Farming through the Lens of Polycentric Governance

Andreas Thiel

Polycentric governing, as understood by the Centre for Global Cooperation Research, addresses the observation that the process of governing has become trans-scalar, trans-sectoral, dispersed, variable, messy, elusive, and headless. In other words, notions of governing as bottom up or top down steering, or governing as involving predominantly fixed jurisdictions and controlled by public agents, have been sidelined. Adopting an inductively driven, institutional economics perspective on governing, the notion of polycentric governance, coined by the Bloomington School of Political Economy, wonders how de facto independent actors jointly produce collective goods, such as policing, clean water or climate change mitigation. Thus, it focuses on the role of institutions for self-organization and order in governing.

Organic farming could be considered a paradigmatic field of polycentric governance. In each country, different constellations of farmers, processors, farmers’ associations, retailers, certifiers, consumers, NGOs, accrediting organizations and public policy makers at different spatial scales and jurisdictional levels affect its development. They provide for food and additional collective goods such as clean water, biodiversity, attractive landscapes, animal welfare or climate change mitigation. In this context, the project addresses the question of how the way in which polycentric governance (i.e. within the organic farming sector) is organized affects its performance. A simultaneous query also looks at how sectors have shaped transnational regulation of organic farming. To this end, sector organization and its performance were researched in Germany, Denmark, Switzerland, Tunisia and Morocco.

Germany and Denmark are members of the European Union and frontrunners in what concerns development of organic farming. Important differences between the two are that in Denmark, organic produce is commercialized under one public label regulated by the EU while in Germany, alongside a public label, seven private labels that go beyond EU standards and that are well-known among consumers exist. A comparison shows that competition between labels, as in Germany, hinders its development to some extent while allowing for product differentiation in relation to consumers. In contrast, in Denmark, product differentiation via existing organic standards is difficult, and therefore new marketing channels are developed. Both countries have significant influence on EU regulation of the sector, with the large, German associations benefiting from their stance in IFOAM International Federation of Organic Agriculture Movements (IFOAM). Switzerland is an organic farming frontrunner but not member of the European Union. The main organic label here is privately controlled. Thus, similar to Suisse conventional agriculture, farmers are interested in protecting their markets against cheaper production from abroad. Thus, organic farmers use the label to restrict access to their markets. Suisse retailers try to control it to exclude incoming retailers. In this regard, in comparison to Germany and Denmark, equity in access and benefits from Suisse organic farming seems less developed.

Tunisia is the most important organic producer country in Africa. It is entirely export-dependent. The sector is weakened by a lack of organization, as a result of a lack of political and economic incentives to organize. Morocco has recently and successfully invested in organizing the sector. This illustrates how order in polycentric governance requires financial means to match elevated transaction costs and governments’ position to create incentives for self-organization by offering stakeholders to co-determine policies and distribution of funds to the sector. The concerns of Moroccan and Tunisian organic sectors get voiced in European policy making only through international, private certification companies that are consulted on European policies.

On the whole, the study shows the productivity of analyzing organic farming through the lens of polycentric governance. Further, it shows how polycentric governance depends on incentives for self-organization, and how its performance depends on equal access to collective goods provisions and financial means to match its costs of organization.

Andreas Thiel was a research fellow at the Centre. He can be reached at thiel@uni-kassel.de.
1st Annual Conference
Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Global Cooperation Research
9–10 April 2019
Gerhard-Mercator-Haus | Lotharstraße 57, 47057 Duisburg

Programme
Tuesday 9 April 2019
09:00–09:15 Registration and Coffee
09:15–09:30 WELCOME REMARKS
Petra Stein (Dean of the Faculty of Social Sciences; PSP WvG, UDE)
Volker Steinkamp (Vice Dean of the Faculty of Humanities, UDE)
09:30–10:45 SESSION 1: CHARTING THE FIELD OF GLOBAL COOPERATION RESEARCH
Chair: Michael Kaeding (Vice Dean of the Faculty of Humanities; IfP; PSP WvG, UDE)
Global cooperation in the 21st century – The KHK’s current research agenda
Sigrid Quack (KHK/GCR21; DoS; PSP WvG, UDE) and Jan Aart Scholte (KHK/GCR21; University of Gothenburg)
The varieties of (global) cooperation: Conceptual approaches from the social sciences
Bettina Mahlert (KHK/GCR21)
Comments on varieties of (global) cooperation from communication studies
Jens Loenhoff (Institute for Communication Studies; PSP WvG, UDE)
10:45–11:15 Coffee break
11:15–12:30 SESSION 2: TRANSFORMATIONS IN GLOBAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION
Chair: Corinne Pernet (Department of General History, UNIGE)
International research cooperation for sustainable development: Policies, funding, knowledge production
Anna Schwachula (DIE)
Norm-making and norm-taking for development cooperation: From diffusion via confusion to fusion
Paulo Esteves (BRICS Policy Centre, PUC-Rio) and Stephan Klingebiel (DIE)
Global politics of debt: Promotion of entrepreneurship and Indebtedness in Turkey
Cagla Diner (KWI)
12:30–13:45 Lunch Break
13:45–15:50 SESSION 3: MULTI-LEVEL LABOUR GOVERNANCE: COOPERATION THROUGH TRANSNATIONAL REGULATION
Chair: Maria Koinova (KHK/GCR21; University of Warwick)
A deep dive or a superficial scratch? The regulation of labour standards via transnational governance arrangements
Christian Scheper (INEF, UDE), Corinna Ulbert (INEF; PSP WvG, UDE) and Johannes Norpoth (INEF, UDE)
Migration governance in the field of high skilled migration
Anja Weiß (DoS and InZentIM; PSP WvG, UDE)
The social (dis)order of cross-border labour: A market sociological perspective on migration in the Asian Pacific
Karen Shire (DoS and IN-EAST; PSP WvG, UDE)
Employee representation in multinational companies: New pathways for transnational cooperation
Thomas Halpeter (IAQ; PSP WvG, UDE) and Sophie Rosenbohm (IAQ, UDE)
When alleged norm beneficiaries gainsay their protectors: Challenges to the global ban on child labour by working children and youth
Carmen Wunderlich (IfP, UDE)
15:50–16:20 Coffee break
16:20–18:00 PARALLEL SESSION 4: AUTHORITY CONTESTATION
SESSION 4A: OVERLAPPING AUTHORITY IN TRANS-SCALAR REGIME COMPLEXITY: CASES FROM AFRICA
Chair: Mirjam Künkler (SCAS)
Overlapping regionalism and peace-building in Africa
Christof Hartmann (IfP; PSP WvG, UDE)
When is more more? The effects of norm collisions and institutional competition on democracy protection in Africa
Theresa Reinold (IfP; PSP WvG, UDE)
Global Cooperation against transnational organized crime in Africa? UN missions, inter-scalar games, and the criminalization of African armed conflicts
Adam Sandor (KHK/GCR21; University of Quebec)
The Gandhian Moment. Globalising anti-colonialism from South Africa
Christoph Marx (Institute of History, UDE)
SESSION 4B: CONTESTING GLOBAL NORMS, POLITICAL EQUALITY AND PUBLIC DISCOURSE
Chair: Peter Drahos (EUI)
From the global to the everyday: How right-wing populism makes anti-globalization appealing Katja Freistein and Christine Unrav (KHK/GCR21)
The formation of the international fact-checking network Lucas Graves (Reuters Institute, University of Oxford) and Laurens Lauer (DoS, UDE)
Beyond the crisis of cosmopolitanism: Reconceiving transnational democracy in the 21st century Andreas Niederberger (Institute of Philosophy and InZentIM; PSP WvG, UDE)
Political equality without social equality? Socio-economic imbalance of low voter turnout in the European elections 2014 and 2019 Michael Kaeding (IFP, PSP WvG, UDE) and Stefan Haußner (IFP, UDE)
18:30 Dinner

Wednesday 10 April 2019
09:30–11:10 SESSION 5: GLOBAL GOVERNANCE OF ENVIRONMENT AND CLIMATE
Chair: Dirk Messner (KHK/GCR21, UNU-EHS)
A theory of planetary politics Franz Mauelshagen (KHK/GCR21)
What the IPCC Fifth Assessment Report has to say about loss and damage from climate change Kees van der Geest (UNU-EHS)
The Implementation of International Agreements: When Do Treaties Matter For Domestic Environmental Legislation? Dominique Blümmer (ETH Zurich), Jean-Frédéric Morin (Université Laval) and Clara Brandi (DIE)
Innovative state-led approaches on the migration – climate nexus Robert Oakes (UNU-EHS)
11:10–11:40 Coffee break
11:40–13:45 SESSION 6: GLOBAL COOPERATION IN THE DEVELOPMENT AND DIFFUSION OF URBAN MODELS AND POLICIES
Chair: Manjiao Chi (UIBE)
International networks and the diffusion of the ‘Garden City’ script in the early 20th century Jens Martin Gurr (Department of Anglophone Studies, PSP Urbane Systeme, UDE) and Barbara Buchenau (Department of American Studies; PSP WvG, UDE)
Edinburgh as the Athens of the North: Architecture, narratives and national identity and international networks of Neo-Classicism Christoph Heyl (Department of Anglophone Studies, UDE)
India’s urban future: Transfer of urban models for a sustainable city development? Katharina Borgmann (IN-EAST, UDE)
On the role of transnational institutional learning for the rise of Shenzhen as an economic centre Markus Taube (IN-EAST; PSP WvG, UDE)
Who rules the smart city? Global data governance and the exercise of power in Toronto’s Quayside project (paper co-authored by Zachary Spicer-University of Toronto) Blayne Haggart (KHK/GCR21; Brock University)
13:45–14:30 Lunch Break
14:30–15:45 SESSION 7: CHALLENGED DEMOCRATIC GOVERNANCE AND ITS PROSPECT IN THE 21ST CENTURY
Chair: Siddharth Mallavarapu (Department of International Relations and Governance Studies, SoHSS, SNU)
A legitimacy crisis of transnational expertise: An obstacle for global cooperation? Sebastian Bättner (DoS, UDE)
‘You must look at it as a bad man’: On the transnational law of tax avoidance Philip Liste (KHK/GCR21)
The dusk of Western democracy promotion as we know it: On democratic recession and its bed fellows Felix S. Bethke (PRIF), Tobias Debiel (KHK/GCR21 and INEF, IFP; PSP WvG, UDE), Annika Elena Poppe (PRIF), Jan Schabitzki (INEF, UDE) and Jonas Wolf (PRIF)
15:45–16:30 Concluding remarks
16:30–18:00 Goodbye reception

List of Abbreviations
DIE Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik / German Development Institute
DoS Department of Sociology
ETH Zurich Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule Zürich (Swiss Federal Institute of Technology in Zurich)
EUI European University Institute
IAQ Institute for Work, Skills and Training
IFP Institute of Political Science
IN-EAST Institute of East Asian Studies
INEF Institute for Development and Peace
InZentIM Interdisciplinary Centre for Integration and Migration Research
KHK/GCR21 Käte Hamburger Kolleg / Centre for Global Cooperation Research
KWI Institute for Advanced Study in the Humanities in Essen
PRIF Peace Research Institute Frankfurt
PSP Urbane Systeme UDE’s Main Research Area ‘Urban Systems’
PSP WvG UDE’s Main Research Area ‘Transformation of Contemporary Societies’
PUC-Rio Pontifical Catholic University of Rio de Janeiro
SCAS Swedish Collegium for Advanced Study
SoHSS, SNU School of Humanities and Social Sciences, Shiv Nadar University
UDE University of Duisburg-Essen
UIBE University of International Business and Economics
UNIGE University of Geneva
UNU-EHS Institute for Environment and Human Security of United Nations University
‘The EU has always been inventive in the application of rules’

Interview with Wolfram Kaiser about Brexit and Governance

When we discuss Brexit with colleagues from the UK, the overall impression is that the majority of UK political scientists are in favour of continued EU membership. Is this impression correct?

Wolfram Kaiser: Correct. The profession in the UK is broadly dominated by left-liberal political thinking and attitudes which favour regional integration and global cooperation. Support for Brexit by political scientists has come mainly from the Corbynite radical left. These colleagues regard the EU as controlled by multinational companies. They see Brexit as the only means to implement socialism in one country. In contrast, several British historians also supported Brexit from a nationalist-conservative vantage point, especially at traditional elite universities.

In the 70s and 80s, Euro-sceptics were predominantly from the political left, whereas Thatcher supported the single market agenda. The recent conflict seems to reflect the rise of a populist and identitarian discourse. What are the reasons for this?

Wolfram Kaiser: The neoliberal globalisation agenda that Thatcher unleashed on the UK fundamentally transformed UK society. It opened up the economy, but also society to greater competition. Faced with new real or apparent risks, those who see themselves as losers of these modernization processes, are easy prey for populists. They direct their discontent at the EU and EU migrants. This despite the fact that the underlying problems are all home-grown: a huge income and wealth gap, bad educational attainment levels especially by white boys from lower social classes, and gross cultural incompetence.

Tensions between the United Kingdom and continental Europe have historic roots. Are past conflicts still a reference point in the current debate?

Wolfram Kaiser: No Angela Merkel with an SS helmet any more. The legacy of Empire seems to be far more important. The British discourse — even of EU supporters — is dominated almost entirely by what ‘we’ want from ‘them’. Hardly anyone seeks to understand what motivates the EU, its member-states and citizens, who are in a far better bargaining position. This latent imperial mind-set is a huge barrier to inter-cultural understanding and regional or global cooperation. Too many people in the UK appear to think that it is a grave injustice that Britannia no longer rules the waves.

Brexit appears to be an opportunity for a greater role of parliaments, both at the EU level and in the UK, to assert their institutional roles. Do you agree?

Wolfram Kaiser: The European Parliament needs to ratify the Brexit treaty and whatever might be the medium-term solution to the EU-UK relationship after the transition period, if there is one. As a liberal Belgian cosmopolitan federalist, Guy Verhofstadt has played a very public role in defending the EP’s position which is above all to maintain EU democracy and the cohesion of the internal market. Brexeters in the UK have claimed that leaving the EU would restore parliamentary democracy in the UK. But they now say that the people have to be saved from their elected representatives. The ‘will of the people’ as apparently expressed in the 2016 referendum trumps their decision at the ballot box in 2017. But importing in this way Rousseau’s notion of the ‘general will’ in a hugely distorted form into the UK parliamentary system has dislodged British democracy and severely undermined the elected parliament with unforeseeable consequences.

The Brexit is a case for the application of international law in a regional setting. But questions, such as - if and how the UK would be represented in the EP after May in the case of a delay to Brexit - cannot be solved by abstract rules alone. Recent research suggests that the more the regulation in international law, the more the room for manoeuvre. Does the Brexit issue also reflect these complexities of our time?

Wolfram Kaiser: The EU has always been inventive in the application of rules. Stopping the clock to conclude negotiations apparently on time, but actually outside a particular legal timeframe has happened more than once before. However, the issue of democratic representation is far more important than wheat prices or a technical regulation. Could the EU really keep the UK inside for some months without democratic representation of British citizens in the EP? At the same time, would...
it be fair to other EU citizens, if UK MEPs were to continue to vote on matters that may very soon not affect the British anymore? Innovative solutions could perhaps be found, for example by prolonging by some months the mandate of the current UK MEPs, but without full voting rights. Yet, no-one in the current populist climate will want to risk allegations that the EU does not care about the democratic rights of citizens.

Regional cooperation was seen as a promising and possibly the most resilient way to coordinate - and thereby transform - nation states around shared values and interests. Does Brexit teach us a lesson and make us understand the value of what we (still) have better?

Wolfram Kaiser: Absolutely, and there is clear evidence that this is true not just of mainstream pro-European elites, but also EU citizens. Support for the EU has significantly gone up. In a sense, the best that could happen to the EU’s legitimacy is a disorderly no-deal Brexit with catastrophic consequences for the UK, rising food prices, traffic chaos, budget deficits and more austerity. But perhaps the surreal domestic conflict in the UK over Brexit is enough of a lesson already: that institutionalized cooperation and compromise-seeking may be cumbersome, but is always to be preferred over conflict; that no single country in the EU matters on a global stage, and that we will have to defend our values and interests together; and that populist leaders are only interested in their career prospects, not their country. Enough to know that the rich Brexit leaders have already transferred their wealth abroad, whereas the deluded worker at the Nissan plant in Sunderland, who followed them, will lose his or her job.

Free speech is not without its rituals. Debates in the House of Commons again and again display the glamour and misery of parliamentary debates. But looking around in the world today, isn’t this ‘biotope’ of parliamentary culture also an asset and a model that emanates, not in the least into civil society in Europe and beyond?

Wolfram Kaiser: The House of Commons is still largely a debating parliament, not a working parliament, despite a degree of policy-making professionalization in recent decades. But has it really managed to articulate arguments for or against particular options in these dire circumstances? I would say that it has been dominated by partisan calculations of party advantage by the two largest political parties and their leaders, whose only interest appears to be how to remain or become Prime Minister. This form of absurd theatre that refuses cross-party cooperation in times of great national peril actually denigrates parliament and undermines democracy. I see nothing positive in aspiring saint to disillusioned rebel. Poland and (counter-)narratives of domination in the EU field.

Professor Kaiser, thank you very much for the interview.

* * *

Wolfram Kaiser is a Professor of European Studies at the University of Portsmouth. Publications include Making the Rules for Europe: Experts, Cartels, International Organizations (Palgrave 2014, with J. Schot). He will be a research fellow at the Centre from June 2019 onwards.
Scientific Advisory Board

On 8 April 2019, the Centre’s Scientific Advisory Board will be convening. Current members are:

Prof. Manjiao Chi
Professor and Founding Director, Center of International Economic Law and Policy (CIELP), University of International Business and Economics (UIBE), Beijing; Senior Fellow at Käte Hamburger Kolleg / Centre for Global Cooperation Research (2014–2015).

Prof. Dr Nicole Deitelhoff
Chair for International Relations and Theories of World Orders at the Cluster of Excellence ‘The Formation of Normative Orders’, Goethe University of Frankfurt, Germany; Executive Director of the Peace Research Institute Frankfurt (PRIF), Germany.

Prof. Peter Drahos
Professor of Law and Governance in the Department of Law, European University Institute, Florence, Italy. He also holds a Chair in Intellectual Property at Queen Mary, University of London.

Prof. Dr Marie-Claire Foblets
Director of the Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology and Head of its Department ‘Law & Anthropology’, Halle, Germany; Honorary Professor of Law and Anthropology, Martin Luther University Halle-Wittenberg, Germany; Member of the Saxon Academy of Sciences.

Prof. Dr Julika Griem
Director of the Institute for Advanced Study in the Humanities (KWI) in Essen; Vice-President of the Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG).

Prof. Dr Daniel Haun
Chair of ‘Early Child Development and Culture’ at the Faculty of Education, University of Leipzig and Founding Director of the Leipzig Research Center for Early Child Development.

Prof. Dr Mirjam Künkler
Mirjam Künkler (Ph.D. Political Science, Columbia University) is Research Professor at the Swedish Collegium for Advanced Study (SCAS). She is a founder and PI of the Iran Data Portal and sits on the boards of various academic journals in the fields of Sociology, Islamic Studies, Political Science, and Law.

Prof. Peggy Levitt
Professor Department of Sociology, Wellesley College, Wellesley, MA; Weatherhead Center for International Affairs—Research Associate and co-director of the Transnational Studies Initiative, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA.

Prof. Siddharth Mallavarapu
Professor at the Department of International Relations and Governance Studies, School of Humanities and Social Sciences at Shiv Nadar University; Senior Fellow at Käte Hamburger Kolleg / Centre for Global Cooperation Research (2013–2014).

Prof. Corinne Pernet
Adjunct Professor with a specialisation in the history of international organizations and modern and contemporary Latin America at the Department of History of the University of Geneva.
Researchers and Themes

New Research Fellows at the Centre

with affiliation, duration of stay, and research topic at the Centre

Dr Joseph Anderson  
University of Gothenburg, Sweden  
1.3. – 30.6.2019  
Theorizing the Entanglements of Public and Private Authority within Migration

Dr Maria Koinova  
University of Warwick, Coventry, UK  
1.4.2019 – 31.3.2020  
Governing Transit Migration: A Relational Approach to Polycentric Governance

Dr Zeynep Şahin Mencutek  
1.3.2019 – 28.2.2020  
Theorizing Multiplicity of Actors in Refugee Governance in the Middle East: Main Host Countries from a Comparative Perspective

Dr Natasha Tusikov  
Brock University, Dept. of Political Science, Canada  
1.5. – 31.7.2019  
Mapping the Knowledge Structure: The Global Political Economy of Knowledge in the Digital Age

Alumni News

Alumni Senior Fellow and member of the Scientific Advisory Board, Manjiao Chi, Professor at UIBE Beijing, has been nominated as an advisor for the ARTNET on FDI network. ARTNET on FDI, recently set up by the United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP) in 2019, is a network on foreign direct investment with the aim to ensure investment policies and treaties, FDI promotion and facilitation in the Asia-Pacific region better support the achievement of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

Alumni Senior Fellow and member of the Scientific Advisory Board, Siddharth Mallavarapu, Professor at the Department of International Relations and Governance Studies at Shiv Nadar University and South Asian University has been appointed on the editorial board of Global Perspectives (an 'online-only, peer-reviewed, transdisciplinary journal') published by the University of California Press for three and a half years, from July 2018 to December 2021. He will be taking on a Visiting Research Professorship at the WZB Berlin Social Science Center for the period of 25 May 2019 to 5 July 2019 with an affiliation to the Global Governance Department.

Alumni Fellow Mneesha Gellman, Assistant Professor of Political Science, Emerson College was awarded a Fulbright US Scholar Fellowship to conduct research in Mexico from January to June 2020, for her new book project ‘Culture Kids: Language Politics and Indigenous Survival in Mexico and the United States’, which examines the ways in which ethnic majority agendas continue to intentionally repress and attempt to extinguish indigenous cultural practices. She was also awarded a Sociological Initiatives grant to support the collaborative element of this research with the Yurok Tribe in northern California.

Crump on ‘Trump on Trade’: A ‘Program on Negotiation’ at Harvard Law School assembled over 30 of the leading conflict resolution and negotiation scholars to study a single negotiator: incumbent US-President Donald Trump. The results were published in the January 2019 Negotiation Journal as a special thematic issue. Alumni Senior Fellow Larry Crump, Griffith University, informs us that ‘it is the first time that the Journal has examined a single individual and their negotiation style’. Crump was the only Australian invited. Trump’s approach challenges many of the core precepts that have emerged in the fields of negotiation and conflict resolution over the past half-century. The special issue includes analysis of Trump’s style and approach, guidance for those dealing with these forms of bargaining, and broader implications in society. The entire issue is freely available at: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/toc/15719979/2019/35/1.
Workshops on Interactions in Polycentric Governance, organized by Fank Gadinger and Jan Aart Scholte

(DIS)ORDER: Techniques, Power and Legitimacy in Polycentric Governing

Duisburg 29–30 October 2018
Duisburg 5–6 March 2019

The ongoing debates around Polycentric Governance change continuously. While they once focused on the emergence of new actors and orders, the recent interest in modes and practices of polycentric governing emphasizes how it has become ever more visible as tangible experience in our everyday lives. The dynamic term ‘governing’ refers here to processes of regulation and ordering in society. By constructing, implementing and securing societal rules, governing brings notable degrees of consistency and predictability to social relations. Governing can also create new possibilities for intervention and transformations. However, these processes have become increasingly ambiguous and raise many questions: How are we being governed today? Which techniques and practices are used? What are obvious and hidden power dynamics within governing? How is governing legitimized; and lastly, where does resistance to various forms of governing take place? For its upcoming book project (DIS)ORDER: Techniques, Power and Legitimacy in Polycentric Governing (working title), the research group on ‘Polycentric Governance’ of the Käte Hamburger Kolleg/Centre for Global Cooperation Research invited international researchers for two authors workshops in October 2018 and March 2019 debating current objectives in polycentric governance research. The book project is in collaboration with the centre’s alumni, current fellows and scholars from external affiliations.

Providing a unique and interdisciplinary approach, scholars from various disciplines such as comparative literature, cultural studies, gender studies, international legal theory, international relations, political science and sociology elaborated on the prospective questions in individual book chapters discussed at the workshop. The joint framework for the project focuses on three major aspects in polycentric governing: techniques, power and legitimacy. Beyond interdisciplinary approaches addressing complex governing arrangements and their current effects, the workshop has created a rich dialogue across different disciplines and offers with its upcoming publication innovative insights to as well as new understandings of contemporary issues in polycentric governing.

The book will be edited by Frank Gadinger and Jan Aart Scholte and is forthcoming in 2020.
Trust and a common language among researchers are essential for advancing our scientific perspectives and understandings. For decades, the Bloomington School of Political Economy at Indiana University, USA, has successfully operated according to these principles. A worldwide community working on common pool resources—such as water, forests, the marine environment but also the Internet or Public health—has been established in this process. Substantial work on the determinants of successful social problem-solving has emerged. A recently reiterated interest of this community addresses polycentric governance, i.e., higher scale and cross-scalar processes of governance relating to collective goods management. Differing from the approach undertaken generally at the Centre for Global Cooperation Research, in this workshop, polycentric governance addresses processes and constellations involving multiple actors and actor groups from an institutional economics perspective.

These elements: a common language, trustful relations between researchers, the Bloomington School approach to polycentric governance and a substantive interest in problems and change of governance of agri-environmental systems at different scales, were the starting points of a highly productive series of events held at the Centre between March 11 and 13, 2019. Particularly, the aim was to address interactions of competitive, coercive and cooperative governance arrangements in polycentric governance. First, the purpose of the Book Workshop was to sound out common foci and language, in order to allow for scientific rigor. Second, this was followed by a Special Issue workshop that aimed at furthering scientific curiosity and providing an overview of cutting edge scholarship in the field. Under the guidance of Andreas Thiel, Fellow at the Centre and of University of Kassel, Germany, Liz Baldwin of University of Arizona, Mark Stephan of Washington State University and Sergio Villamayor-Tomas of Autonomous University of Barcelona, altogether twenty one scholars from Northern America and Europe came together at the Centre for Global Cooperation Research to discuss during the period of these two events. Indeed, a very productive mix of people—some who knew each other well already and others who were meeting for the first time, junior and senior scholars, scholars who have been engaging with polycentric governance for a long time and those who have begun to do so recently—gathered with a common purpose for this workshop.

Through these three days it became clear that explicit focus on interactions and relations in polycentric governance holds potential and has been overlooked thus far in scholarship on polycentric governance. Quite naturally, it brings together aspects of larger scale dynamics affecting governance and it fosters a combination of Social Network and Institutional Analysis. With this combination of workshops, a focused illustration of how the analysis of interactions in polycentric governance can bear fruit was accomplished. Additionally, the workshops also provided an overview of methods and frames that can be associated with it. In the foreseeable future an edited volume, as well as a Special Issue, is planned as outputs from these meeting. An important takeaway from the workshop for the academic community was that irrespective of how coherent a community is and for how long the members have known each other, at some point detailed discussions in person are essential, to bring such a project to fruition. None of this would have been possible without the kind support of the Centre and the professionalism of its Events Team. (organizer’s note)
Upcoming Public Events

16 April 2019
31st Käte Hamburger Lecture
Visions of World Order in Pan-Africanism
Rita Abrahamsen, Professor in the Graduate School of Public and International Affairs and the Director of the Centre for International Policy Studies (CIPS), University of Ottawa
18:00-19:30
Gerhard-Mercator-Haus, Lotharstr. 57, 47057 Duisburg
Developing a morphological analysis, Rita Abrahamsen argues that Pan-African ideology is a fluid and historically contingent patterned way of thinking about the social and political world. The current world order was not 'made in the West', but produced in interaction with Pan-African ideas and values. Understanding the manner in which Pan-Africanism informs and legitimates diverse political agendas is thus of crucial importance for IR, for Pan-Africanists, and for the future of world order.

Please register until 13 April at events@gcr21.uni-due.de.

29 April 2019
13th Käte Hamburger Dialogue
Endless Peacebuilding? The Missions in Afghanistan and Mali
Organized by Käte Hamburger Kolleg / Centre for Global Cooperation Research (KHK/GCR21), German Development Institute / Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE) and BICC (Bonn International Center for Conversion)
18:00-20:00
NRW Representative Office in Berlin
Hiroshimastraße 12–16, 10785 Berlin
The core idea of this event is to reflect ongoing peace operations in Afghanistan and Mali, which are both of high interest for European and German policy. Increasing tensions between local demands and substantive interests of the intervening countries and the policy of the governments in Afghanistan and Mali question the missions’ contributions to sustainable peace. This Dialogue aims to focus on the question to what extend both missions appropriately take local structures into account and which goal/end they can realistically pursue.
Keynote by Zahabi Ould Sidi Mohamed, Former Minister of Foreign Affairs and Reconciliation of Mali
Panellists: Isaline Bergamaschi (ULB), Florian Künn (GCR21), Katja Mielke (BICC), Zahabi Ould Sidi Mohamed

8 May 2019
32nd Käte Hamburger Lecture
Global Injustices and the Ethics of Political Reconciliation
Henning Hahn, Visiting Professor, The Institute of Philosophy, FU Berlin
18:00-19:30
Gerhard-Mercator-Haus, Lotharstr. 57, 47057 Duisburg
Initially, the idea of political reconciliation plays an important role in debates on transitional justice. It defines a transition process from a state of severe injustice or conflict to a state of renewed social peace and cooperation. This understanding is based on the precedence of South Africa’s shift from apartheid to democracy and, in particular, by the work of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) in the 1990s. In the 32nd Käte Hamburger Lecture, partly in continuity and partly in contrast, Hahn will apply the normative rationale of political reconciliation to current debates on global injustices. His underlying thesis is that the idea of reconciliation fits better with the non-ideal circumstances and transcultural challenges in the global arena.

13 May 2019
14th Käte Hamburger Dialogue
From 'Another world is possible' to 'Our country first'? Populism and Global Cooperation
Benjamin De Cleen, Vrije Universiteit Brussel
Daphne Halikiopoulou, University of Reading
Wolfram Kaiser, University of Portsmouth
In this rejection of global cooperation – be it in trade, migration, peacebuilding, environmental protection or other fields – Trump is not alone. When turning to the question of why these de-legitimations of global cooperation are so successful, it is important to realize that they are not only based on a rejection. Instead, they refer to powerful techniques of storytelling about a glorious past and a bright future. In times of growing inequalities and dwindling prospects for political and social participation, liberalism has lost its story and its visionary power. Across the world, this void is perceived by the populists and compensated for with new narratives and new emotion norm.
Against this background, this Käte Hamburger Dialogue sets out to discuss questions concerning the relationship between populism and the de-legitimation of global cooperation.

See also: Interview with Wolfram Kaiser and conference programme, page 12–13.
Public Events (Overview)

Migration

29 / 01
Käte Hamburger Lecture
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 Aalberts

Urban Utopia

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

Pan-Africanism

16 / 04
Käte Hamburger Lecture
Visions of World Order in Pan-Africanism with Rita Abrahamsen

Peacebuilding

29 / 04
Käte Hamburger Dialogue
Endless Peacebuilding? The Missions in Afghanistan and Mali (in cooperation with BICC and DIE)

Injustice

08 / 05
Käte Hamburger Lecture
Global Injustices and the Ethics of Political Reconciliation with Henning Hahn

Migration

09 / 05
1st Global Migration Lecture
Refugia: Towards a Transnational Polity with Nick Van Hear (in cooperation with InZentIM)

Populism

13 / 05
Käte Hamburger Dialogue
From ‘Another world is possible’ to ‘Our country first’? Populism and Global Cooperation

Progress

22 / 05
Käte Hamburger Lecture
Progress and Regression (tbc) with Rahel Jaeggi (in cooperation with the Institute for Philosophie, UDE)

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

Deepshikha Shahi (2018): Kautilya and Non-Western IR Theory

An original intervention that ventures into uncharted territory in the discipline globally, this book encapsulates Deepshikha Shahi’s core exploration during her fellowship at the Centre: Indian philosophical contribution to post-Western International Relations theory. The book reads the ancient Indian text of Kautilya’s Arthaśāstra independent from the assumptions arising out of Classical Realism and Neorealism. Thus, it charts a parallel history of Kautilya’s Arthaśāstra and Eurocentric IR – showing the ways in which the paths meet as well as diverge, and produces an eclectic, non-Western theory of international relations.


Hellmann, Gunther (Hg.) (2018): Theorizing Global Order. The International, Culture and Governance

This book brings together diverse contemporary perspectives on how global order can be theoretically conceptualized. In doing so, it fills a crucial and surprising gap in International Relations theory. The theorization of International Relations often pivots around conceptualization of terminologies and categories, such as the implications of ‘international’, ‘global’, ‘systems’ and so on, and yet, the concept of ‘order’, in spite of being so central to much of IR’s formulations, has remained undertheorized. This book rectifies this, enriching the field.


Gadinger, Frank, Smith Ochoa, Christopher, Yildiz, Taylan (2019): Resistance or Thuggery? Political Narratives of Urban Riots

This article demonstrates the relevance of narrative analysis in politics. The study of most political categories—be it political authority, democratic legitimacy or identity building, for example—is closely related to the concept of narrative. By analyzing two cases of urban riots—the riots of Paris in 2005 and Baltimore in 2015—the article elucidates upon myriad cultural practices of storytelling. While on one hand the state narratives criminalize the riots, on the other hand, a micro-oriented perspective focusing on people’s everyday life experiences, undertaken here, shows how sudden violence in urban riots is often a desperate expression of marginalized voices articulating moral claims of justice, particularly concerning everyday racism. This special issue is edited by Stefan Groth, a former fellow at the Centre.

Gadinger, Frank; Smith Ochoa, Christopher; Yildiz, Taylan (2019). Resistance or Thuggery? Political Narratives of Urban Riots, in Narrative Culture 6:1, Special Issue: Political Narratives - Narrations of the Political (edited by Stefan Groth), 88–111.

Helland, Leif; Hovi, Jon; Sælen, Håkon (2018): Climate leadership by conditional commitments

Closely following the Centre’s focus on the policy field of climate change, this article attempts to answer a crucial question—while the signatories of the 2015 Paris Agreement set their own mitigation target by submitting a Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC) every five years, would the introduction of conditional components therein enhance the agreement’s effectiveness? Through a closely controlled laboratory experiment—based on a mixed sequential-simultaneous public good game with one leader and three followers—the authors produce findings that have important implications concerning the future success of the Paris Agreement.

Reviews


Sumudu Atapattu and Andrea Schapper’s book combines their specialisms in law and politics to explore the dynamics between environmental policies and human rights laws and institutions. Can these institutions provide relief for victims of environmental degradation? What are the pros and cons of using a human rights framework in the context of climate change? Enriched with pedagogical features, it is an interdisciplinary textbook which will be essential for students across disciplines.


Global Society: Volume 33, 2019 - Issue 1: Critique and Affirmation in International Relations

In this issue of the journal, four articles whose research was facilitated by the Centre reflect the Centre’s diverse range of thematic engagements.

Pol Bargués-Pedreny’s article, ‘From Critique to Affirmation in International Relations’, serves as an introduction to the Special Issue. Peter Finkenbusch’s ‘On the Road to Affirmation: Facilitating Urban Resilience in the Americas’ looks at how the resilience discourse seems to be set on overcoming the remaining analytical reductionism of neo-liberal policy frameworks, and its implications for international policy engagement in the Global South. The article investigates this with reference to the evolution of crime-related US security interventions in the Americas, recurring especially on the Merida Initiative.

Within the rubric of the Centre’s work on climate change, Pol Bargués-Pedreny and Jessica Schmidt’s article, ‘Learning to Be Postmodern in an All Too Modern World: Whatever Action in International Climate Change Imaginaries’, looks at the contradiction that drives current climate change programmes: the environment is ours to manipulate and yet is out of reach. They argue that the current policy scenario is describable as a space of multiple initiatives with no telos.

Joe Hoover’s ‘Developing a Situationist Global Justice Theory: from an architectonic to a consummatory approach’, looks at the paradox within conventional global justice theory: it is concerned for the suffering of individuals around the world, but doesn’t ensure that the experiences of these individuals shape the theories of global justice. The article, using the Grenfell Tower fire as an example, suggests that a consummatory approach allows these individual experiences to be voiced and conceives of justice as a quality of social relationships.


Selected Publications
April 2019 (received since December 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.


Boege, Volker; Rinck, Patricia (2019). The Local/International Interface in Peacebuilding: Experiences from Bougainville and Sierra Leone, in International Peacekeeping (26), 216–239.


Gadinger, Frank; Smith Ochoa, Christopher; Yildiz, Taylan (2019). Resistance or Thuggery? Political Narratives of Urban Riots, in Narrative Culture 6 (1), Special Issue: Political Narratives - Narrations of the Political, 88–111.


Scheck, Stefan; Gutekunst, Miriam (2019). Studying marriage migration to Europe from below: informal practices of government, border struggles and multiple entanglements, in Gender, Place & Culture 0 (0): 1–15. DOI: 10.1080/09690189.2018.1489375.


The Centre's new website displays in a new responsive design on your portable devices and will soon provide a new section. 'Opinion' invites contributions to current topics and will focus on recent developments in the Centre’s policy fields: climate, peacebuilding, migration and internet.

Every Wednesday...

...we tweet the Centre’s MID WEEK BRIEF on current affairs under the lense of our policy fields (peacebuilding as an example, see graphic). Our twitter bird loves to cite statements from fellows and affiliated scholars as well as public figures related to our research.
Global Cooperation
Research Papers
ISSN 2198-1949 (Print)
ISSN 2198-0411 (Online)
doi: 10.14282/2198-0411-GCRP-[issue]

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 Sahin Mencutek
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

17 Region-Making and Cross-Border Cooperation. New Evidence from Four Continents
Edited by Elisabetta Nadalutti, Otto Kallscheuer
182 pp | Hb: 9781138719071
eBook: 9781315195605
£115.00
£92.00

16 The Justification of Responsibility in the UN Security Council
By Holger Niemann
248 pp | Hb: 9781138569898
eBook: 9780203703984
£115.00
£92.00

15 Prospective Migration Policy – Scenario Building on Relations Between West Africa and Europe
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