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Greeting »Käte«
Welcome to the Centre

Dear Reader

Our Centre’s second year has been a remarkably dynamic one. During 2013, the intercultural and interdisciplinary environment which we open up to potential researchers attracted over thirty scholars from five different continents to take up fellowships with us. Whilst firmly anchored in their eight respective disciplines, these scholars made full use of the ‘thinking space’ provided by the Centre – and generously Funded by the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research.

Our multi-faceted research agenda comprises four ‘units’: the (im)possibilities of cooperation; the cultural helps and hindrances to cooperation; issues of global governance; and paradoxes of democratization. Overarching all four research units is the endeavour to determine what part cooperation can play in tackling global challenges. In this connection, the introduction to the present report advocates moving beyond conventional conceptions of homo oeconomicus or homo sociologicus and instead looking at the advantages made in relevant areas of research. Through contributions to international conferences and via our new publications series, fellows and core member have together done much to bring our research agenda to scholarly and public attention.

This report offers a glimpse of the wide range of activities and stimulating ideas that have shaped 2013 for us at the Centre. Our success over the last year would not have been possible without the hard work of colleagues on the permanent staff, their eight respective disciplines, and instead looking at the advantages made in relevant areas of research. Through contributions to international conferences and via our new publications series, fellows and core member have together done much to bring our research agenda to scholarly and public attention.

Our core academic team likewise play a crucial role, developing their individual projects, fostering new ideas, and consolidating and reflecting upon the advances made in relevant areas of research. Through contributions to international conferences and via our new publications series, fellows and core member have together done much to bring our research agenda to scholarly and public attention.

We wish you an inspiring read!

Markus Böckenförde
Tobias Debiel
Claus Leggewie
Dirk Messner

‘Diversity at all levels’

When we consider the challenges that cities such as Duisburg currently face in the areas of economy, social policy and the environment, it becomes ever more obvious that we often have to go further than the local or regional level to deal with them. The problems of our time require a common debate, and we have to cast our eyes far beyond the confines of our city.

One institution that has this aim at heart is the Käte Hamburger Kolleg/Centre for Global Cooperation Research in Duisburg’s Inner Harbour. In collaboration with the University of Duisburg-Essen, scientists from all over the world have been working here since April 2012 in joint pursuit of a new concept of global cooperation for the future.

The approaches developed at the Käte Hamburger Kolleg demonstrate that on the global scale understanding is of key importance, just as in every town and city. The diversity and openness of the discussions that take place at the Centre and the initiatives that issue from its search for global solutions also benefit us here in our own community. They help us to gain a better grasp of the questions that arise at local level. How can multiple cultures function within our communities? Is there a third way, as the Käte Hamburger Kolleg is proposing and deliberating? Does this transcultural process exist in Duisburg? Is there a path of development that actively involves everyone? And is there the readiness to openly engage with others?

We have to make it possible to redress balances and be prepared to share available resources. A mere look at developments in our own country illustrates that the competition between local communities is not being played out on level ground.

There are regions and communities that are finding it very difficult to realise positive, sustainable development on their own.

During the next two years, one of the predominant topics to be explored by the Käte Hamburger Kolleg is ‘The World of Regions’. This interesting field is by no means about further limiting local autonomy through excessive regulation. What we envisage is a flexible system encouraging strategies of redistribution and mutual support. We want to see at the level of regional cooperation a responsibility to protect that takes advantage of proximity and that can alleviate the need for regulation by the larger entities in the medium term.

Together with those working at the Käte Hamburger Kolleg, I am convinced that it is worthwhile maintaining and nurturing diversity at all levels. This will take time, but we can only bring about long-term, positive development if we do not leave anyone behind – neither globally nor locally. And with that thought, I would like to wish the Käte Hamburger Kolleg, one of the most exciting research centres in our region, further fruitful and productive years in our city and all the best for the future.

Sören Link
Mayor of Duisburg

Markus Böckenförde
Tobias Debiel
Claus Leggewie
Dirk Messner

Sören Link
Mayor of Duisburg
Global Cooperation Outlook
Investigating Cooperation in Global Governance

Beyond *homo oeconomicus* and *homo sociologicus*: Investigating Cooperation in Global Governance

Tobias Debiel, Claus Leggewie, Dirk Messner

Investigation into the shaping of global policy continues to be dominated by the ‘major schools’ of International Relations theory. Particularly influential in this regard are: Neorealism, which focuses on power-advantage and power-balance and lays stress on conflict and competition; rationalist institutionalism, which in certain circumstances considers a regulated form of collaboration logical and viable if it reduces costs – in time, energy, and resources – for all those involved; and lastly constructivism (and similarly sociological institutionalism), with its stress on the idealized dimension of norms, through which actors’ preferences are sometimes first shaped and which offer various options for sanction in the case of non-compliance.

In the field of global cooperation, research has for some time tended to be rather narrowly fixated on the conflict between rationalist approaches, which foreground the cost-benefit-motivated-individual (*homo oeconomicus*), and sociological approaches, which take Ralf Dahrendorf’s *homo sociologicus* – an individual who conforms to society’s role-related expectations or (in social-constructivist terms) operates in a strongly norm-oriented way – as the starting-point for theories of human action. Both approaches have come up with impressive findings on the ever more closely intertwined and multi-faceted nature of global financial markets and the safeguarding of freedoms and basic human rights – we find ourselves confronted with an empirical quandary in regard to cooperation: How can it be that there is broad consensus, not just amongst scientific experts, but also amongst political decision-makers, on the need for a political change of course but that this consensus is not translated into corresponding imperatives for action, and follow-through, in the domain of international cooperation?

'Self-irritation' and Prevailing Theories

One crucial factor in the investigation of these issues, particularly at the outset, is ‘self-irritation’ – a feature typical of the scholarly enterprise and the scholarly community. The continual falsification of existing assumptions (Popper), with the aim of establishing (provisional) truth (Luhmann) – or, to put it less formally, solving an intellectual or practical problem – is a major motor of scholarly endeavour. The self-irritation of an established body of knowledge through consideration of ‘off-centre’ ideas is thus one of the motivating forces of scholarly endeavour and involves, amongst other things, subjecting specific assumptions held by a particular academic sector to a process of questioning and, where appropriate, productive demolition. In our case, this means eschewing unreflecting references to the definitions and implications we have posited as fundamental to the concept of cooperation and instead subjecting these to questioning. In other words, the research process initially makes it less clear what we mean by cooperation, what motives and mechanisms are assumed to underlie it, and what outcomes it should produce.

The rationalists in International Relations, who regard issues of global governance as primarily ‘their province’, argue, rather plausibly, that in current global conditions there is little likelihood of international cooperation – which, in the view of the Neorealists, could play out as a multipolar struggle for power. The best that could happen, they argue, is that a hegemon could put in place rules and institutional structures designed to promote cooperation. Liberal institutionalism is less pessimistic and assumes that states are interested in more than just ‘relative advantages’ (i.e. status enhancement vis-à-vis adversaries). Being rational actors, say these theorists, states also have to rethink the way we discuss human social behaviour. There is no doubt that our social behaviour has evolved. This means that the most successful or ‘selfish’ strategies have been selected for. The good news is therefore that in most circumstances cooperative behaviour is actually behaviour that is in the interests of the individual. All in all, there are very few natural situations in which social circumstances lead to uncooperative behaviour in humans. What we therefore need to do is understand the social circumstances better, so that we can adjust them to favour cooperation.

What are the factors that are most conducive to cooperation, or that undermine it, in small and large groups?

In humans, we have found that being able to call on processes such as reciprocity, reputation building, and punishment is key in promoting cooperative behaviour whereas anonymity is unfavourable to it.

The idea that humans are narrowly, or indeed exclusively, focused on their own interests has a long intellectual tradition – think of Thomas Hobbes’ ‘war of every man against every man’, or Adam Smith’s *homo oeconomicus*, or Herbert Spencer’s concept of the ‘survival of the fittest’. Do we need to rethink our basic idea about what drives human behaviour?

Prof. Dr Dirk Semmann

Humans are described as ‘super-cooperators’ by Martin Nowak, Professor of Biology and Mathematics and Director of the Program for Evolutionary Dynamics at Harvard University. What lies behind this notion and how does it fit (or not) with the collapse of cooperation-structures we see around us and the current dynamics in the international political system?

We are one of the most cooperative species on this planet, especially when you think that we cooperate mainly with individuals who are not related to us. In other species, high levels of cooperation such as this are only found where the interacting individuals are very closely related – amongst ants and bees, for example. Successful cooperation has helped us expand to inhabit all the different climatic regions of the earth and our cooperative endeavours often extend over the vast geographical distances that lie between them. Humans cooperate in groups of all sizes and are able to divide up large-scale cooperative tasks between a great many individuals. Language plays a key role here: it enables humans to exchange information relating to social behaviour – even about absent third parties. Our social system thus allows for better control of others – via reputation building and punishment, for example – than in any other species. That said, where social dilemmas arise in which these kinds of control mechanisms are absent (in situations of anonymity, for example), humans often do not manage to sustain cooperation.

When we see cooperative structures failing on a global or international level – we can therefore assume that individuals are having to make their decisions under conditions that are not conducive to cooperation and are lacking some of these crucial control mechanisms.

The idea that humans are narrowly, or indeed exclusively, focused on their own interests has a long intellectual tradition – think of Thomas Hobbes’ ‘war of every man against every man’, or Adam Smith’s *homo oeconomicus*, or Herbert Spencer’s concept of the ‘survival of the fittest’. Do we need to rethink our basic idea about what drives human behaviour?
exploit opportunities for ‘absolute gains’ that are realized jointly. However, it must be said that since at least the time of the global financial crisis, and the Eurocrisis that followed it, institutionalist approaches which, for example, favour the partial cession or joint exercise of state sovereignty (shared sovereignty) have found themselves in dire need of vindication and endorsement. It has become clear just how fragile the cutting-edge liberal integration-project is. One exciting approach is that offered by social constructivists, who view human action as strongly norm-oriented and interpret it in a more open way. This brings into the frame discursive processes and patterns of argument in which norms and guiding moral notions are floated, explored, and challenged (Risse 2000). Such perspectives are crucial to a proper understanding of cooperation and conflict. However, the social constructivist approach can only provide partial answers – and is fast reaching its limits in the second decade of the 21st century. In particular, it is at pains to explain why the change driven by ‘norm entrepreneurs’ – in regard to the understanding of state sovereignty, for example, or the increasing responsibility of the world community – can and should be understood as ‘world events’. The social constructivist approach also has an – often under-estimated – emotional component. Thanks to its evolutionary, and anthropological make-up, humans have a peculiar human capacity for cooperation. The physical capacity for cooperation. The physical capacity for cooperation. The cooperative potential of ‘human nature’ – in other words the biological, evolutionary, and anthropological make-up and dynamic that prompts, hinders, or facilitates cooperation (Messner/Guarín/Haun 2013; Nowak/Sigmund 2005). Working precisely along these lines, Samuel Bowles and Herbert Gintis, in their book A Cooperative Species (2013), have recently shown that, because of genetic and cultural evolution, humans are especially cooperative beings. Ethical norms play a major role in helping humans to develop their cognitive, linguistic, and physical capacity for cooperation. The authors define cooperation in very simple – and therefore compelling – terms: ‘By cooperation we mean engaging with others in a mutually beneficial activity.’ In this sense, cooperation can indeed mean the joint pursuit of previously defined goals, but it can also encompass mutually advantageous activities in which there is implicit purpose rather than an explicit definition of goals.

Why Human Beings Cooperate

Prompted by both the strengths and the weaknesses evinced in the narrower academic field of global governance and international relations, we have adopted an approach to research that points beyond the specialist field. Interdisciplinary research accords substantial space to the failure of cooperation, and to the possibility of avoiding such failure through more appropriate institutional arrangements. But such an approach needs, as it were, to double-check itself against the cooperative potential of ‘human nature’ – in other words the biological, evolutionary, and anthropological make-up and dynamic that prompts, hinders, or facilitates cooperation (Messner/Guarín/Haun 2013; Nowak/Sigmund 2005). Working precisely along these lines, Samuel Bowles and Herbert Gintis, in their book A Cooperative Species (2013), have recently shown that, because of genetic and cultural evolution, humans are especially cooperative beings. Ethical norms play a major role in helping humans to develop their cognitive, linguistic, and physical capacity for cooperation. The authors define cooperation in very simple – and therefore compelling – terms: ‘By cooperation we mean engaging with others in a mutually beneficial activity.’ In this sense, cooperation can indeed mean the joint pursuit of previously defined goals, but it can also encompass mutually advantageous activities in which there is implicit purpose rather than an explicit definition of goals.

It is often assumed that behind cooperation there lurks self-interest – and this is frequently the case. However, it makes analytic sense to mention other, equally empirically observable, motives such as enlightened self-interest and altruism here. Thanks to its evolutionary roots, cooperation also has an – often under-estimated – emotional component. It can simply make people happy. But the peculiar human capacity for cooperation also draws on feelings that we would not unconditionally categorize as positive. Thus the thirst for punishment – of freeloaders, for example – can also be seen as a stabilizing element in cooperative groupings. In this connection, Bowles and Gintis (2002) talk of what they call home cooperatives as one permutation of homo cooperativus.

From the Individual to the Social Group: The Problem of Scaling

‘Enlightened self-interest’, ‘altruism’, and emotional stabilizers thus promote cooperation. Robert Axelrod (2006) has also shown that, given certain framework-conditions, egoistic benefit-maximizers may even cooperate without being compelled to do so by laws or moral precepts. Similarly, Elinor Ostrom (2003) has identified four key factors that shape group behaviour vis-à-vis social dilemmas: 1. maximum directness of communication; 2. options for penalizing opportunistic behaviour; 3. the fact that people do not act on the basis of objective ‘rational choices’ but against a background of learned norms, rules, and heuristic approaches which favour cooperative behaviour – and which can also hamper or actually block it; and 4. the fact that people tend to react positively to positive behaviour by others, and negatively to negative behaviour, and this orientation to reciprocity translates into incentives to garner trust and good repute by keeping promises and cultivating cooperative behaviour even when this results in short-term disadvantage.

Cooperation and the number of those involved in it are not unconnected. Dunbar (1993) shows that the size of human groups remains remarkably constant in evolutionary terms: an effectively functioning interest-group formed to pursue a defined set of goals rarely comprises more than 150 individuals. This means that in the case of complex political processes in particular, where a variety of governmental, supra-governmental, and private actors are involved, a problem of scale comes into play. Just how such task-sharing mega-collectives become capable of cooperation has so far remained a mystery.
The Mysterious ‘Culture Factor’

Once the spotlight is turned on homo cooperativus, new approaches open up that scarcely figure at all in the classic constructs of homo oeconomicus and homo sociologicus. Again, homo cooperativus is embedded in a cultural context and research on this ‘culture factor’ has so far been surprisingly tentative. Whenever cooperation fails to materialize, ‘culture’ is wheeled out as the left-over factor – firstly in order to explain the failure and then possibly also to overcome or avert it. Instead of taking a rigid a priori stance on the benign or malign effect of cultural contracts, we would do better to pay greater attention to the ‘culture of cooperation’ itself. Cooperative relations, after all, do not rest solely on a tit-for-tat alignment of interests – in other words, a division of anticipated benefits and mutual obligations as practised by homo oeconomicus. Cooperation is also – notably – a hallmark of the ‘pointless’ play engaged in by children; and when a music ensemble improvises it does not do so (merely) to sell records.

These modest examples demonstrate the intrinsic value of cooperation – a value that is rooted in empathy and emergent in character, in other words arises from the process itself. Gift-giving (Mauss 2007 [1925]), which sets a value that is rooted in empathy and emergent in character, in other words, a division of anticipated benefits and mutual obligations as practised by homo oeconomicus. Cooperation is also – notably – a hallmark of the ‘pointless’ play engaged in by children; and when a music ensemble improvises it does not do so (merely) to sell records.

Re-Focusing on Successful Problem-Solving

The homo cooperativus construct, initially posited by behavioural economics, starts from a heterogeneous view of humanity that goes beyond instrumental rationality (Rogall 2002). Our aim in conceptualizing this particular actor is to create a shared point of reference for interdisciplinairy research. Homo cooperativus here means a complex being, influenced by social norms and institutional context as well as by considerations of instrumental rationality, and with preferences that evolve (including situationally) rather than being predetermined. Our model also incorporates evolutionary and cultural features that are difficult to comprehend using only rationalist and constructivist approaches. This kind of research, designed around plurality, is littered with pitfalls and can easily become enmeshed in ontological, epistemological,
The second year at the Käte Hamburger Kolleg/Centre for Global Cooperation Research has taken us further on our path exploring the research field of global cooperation. The Centre’s approach to the issue of global cooperation is truly interdisciplinary, going beyond the narrow fields of international relations and global governance, and including insights from other relevant disciplines as diverse as evolutionary biology, behavioural economics or security studies. In 2013, the Centre hosted 31 experts and experts from various disciplinary backgrounds and 16 different countries for a period from six to twelve months. This interdisciplinary approach has already proven to be successful: recent multi-disciplinary research has shown that cooperation is much more common than previously expected, and that there is indeed a human predisposition to cooperate. What does this mean for cooperation research? The ‘cooperation hexagon’ developed by the Centre’s co-director Dirk Messner, together with Alejandro Guarnín and Daniel Hau, gives an understanding of the mechanisms that determine whether or not cooperation is successful, thus paving the way for a more comprehensive theory of international relations that reflects these recent findings on the fundamentally cooperative nature of human behaviour. Their paper, followed by a publication by former fellow Dirk Peters, launched the Centre’s new Global Cooperation Research Papers Series. Regarding one of the central research questions of research unit 1, the difficult question of how this human predisposition to cooperate can be translated to the much more complex macro level of global cooperation, first attempts at an answer were made at the Masterclass Retreat which took place in the context of the arts festival Ruhrtriennale and which brought together international experts of cooperation research from various disciplines to think about how to improve global cooperation given the complexity of the issue. For instance, can there be a global ‘we-identity’ – ‘we-identity’ being one of the factors of the ‘cooperation hexagon’ – that facilitates cooperation across states and cultures? How does the ‘factor cooperation’ affect cooperation? Research unit 2 has pursued its conceptual and empirical research on the complex relationship between culture and global cooperation, which is still a blind spot in research. Beyond that, we continued exploring the conditions for successful cooperation in a series of workshops throughout the year. Besides analyzing examples of intentional cooperation, e.g. by people working on wikipedia, the focus was also laid on non-intentional forms of cooperation such as market mechanisms or computer-controlled stock-exchange trading. Given that world society is to a great extent driven by forces that cannot be traced back to rational, intentional strategies, analysing such automatic and non-intentional forms of cooperation of the ‘invisible hand’ is highly relevant for global cooperation research. Furthermore, in order to identify conditions and criteria of successful cooperation, a variety of empirical examples of global cooperation in areas as diverse as development cooperation, the International Criminal Court or the European Space Agency were analyzed. In order to be able to successfully deal with global problems such as the financial crisis, effective and legitimate institutions for global governance are of central importance. But which structures and processes of global governance are evolving in our increasingly complex world – and are they the right ones to manage the diverse global problems? Research unit 3 is concerned with the impact of emerging processes of global change on the prospects for cooperation, with a special focus on the increasing influence of non-state actors, e.g. in international negotiations, as well as the perspectives and rising influence of non-Western states such as China or India in development cooperation and other policy fields. Following the idea of going beyond Western perspectives, former Senior Fellow Jan Aart Scholte organized a workshop taking place within in the Building Global Democracy Programme, at which a group of experts from diverse regional, cultural and disciplinary backgrounds discussed strategies of approaching cultural diversity within global governance and of constructing frameworks for global cooperation that are legitimate across different world regions. What would a legitimate global order look like? Current research is still biased, focussing on how Western democracy as a universal standard can be applied at the global level instead of finding out what the various actors involved in global governance themselves consider legitimate. Apart from engaging in theoretical and methodological discussions on core political concepts such as democratic legitimacy, governance and global democracy, research unit 4 analyzes how actual processes of democratization, especially in Africa and the Middle East, impact upon global cooperation, taking into account potential opportunities as well as of challenges democratization may pose for cooperation. Besides other concrete examples of global cooperation such as the ‘democratic wars’ of Western interventionism or the ‘responsibility to protect’, the concept and practice of peacebuilding was the subject of a critical discussion, which developed at an international workshop at the Centre and resulted in a publication subsequently, “Relational Sensibility and the ‘Turn to the Local’: Prospects For The Future of Peacebuilding”, edited by Wren Chadwick, Tobias Debiel and Frank Gadinger, was the second of the Centre’s Global Dialogues, Following another volume edited by Claus Leggewie and Marcel Siepmann. Our factory report shows: the second year of research at the Centre for Global Cooperation Research has brought lots of important insights into the various areas of cooperation and has further helped us explore the field of global cooperation research. At the same time, it has become clear that there remain many open questions to be discussed, among them the notion of cooperation in all its facets, especially in the interdisciplinary context of the Centre.
The (Im)Possibility of Cooperation
Research Unit 1
Head of Research Unit 1
Silke Weinlich

Scale, Complexity, and Human Behaviour: Global Cooperation under Scrutiny

Key Questions

Global cooperation – and when it can and cannot succeed – is the central theme addressed in Research Unit 1: ‘The (Im)Possibility of Cooperation’.

We are rapidly approaching our planet’s limits; advancing climate-change and the ravages to biological diversity are jeopardizing our natural life-support systems. At the same time, accelerating processes of globalization are resulting in an ever more extensive intermeshing of markets, states, societies, and individuals. Many of the problems we face today cannot be solved by nations acting alone: in order to tackle current global crises – and those that loom on the horizon – we need to intensify cooperation at local, national, international, and global level. Yet many of our existing norms, rules, and institutions appear ill-adapted to promoting this kind of cooperation.

Our approach in Research Unit 1 is radically multi-disciplinary. Our aim is to draw in the knowledge garnered by disciplines not usually concerned with global cooperation and make it accessible to, and fruitful for, social science researchers exploring international cooperation and global governance. Guiding the work of the Unit are three core questions: 1. What are the conditions conducive to cooperation? 2. What are the consequences of increasing scale and complexity when it comes to cooperation on global problems, and how can these consequences be dealt with? 3. How can the prospects of successful global cooperation be enhanced?

Achievements in 2013

During 2013, we succeeded in setting our research agenda firmly within a national and international context. The general thrust of our research was made clear in the first of the Centre’s Global Cooperation Research Papers, in which Dirk Messner, Alejandro Guarín, and Daniel Hauß drew on multi-disciplinary evidence to show that cooperation among people is much more common than rational-theory models predict and that this may result from the fact that we have a naturally evolved predisposition to cooperate. The authors describe seven basic mechanisms that determine whether or not cooperation is successful and sustainable – reciprocity, trust, communication, reputation, fairness, enforcement, and ‘we-identity’ – and they group these into a ‘cooperation hexagon’, with reciprocity at the centre. They conclude with a call for a radical change of perspective and a new, more comprehensive theory of international cooperation consonant with recent insights into the fundamentally cooperative nature of human behaviour.

We are rapidly approaching our planet’s limits; advancing climate-change agreement and those aimed at defining a new generation of development goals.

The Way Ahead

In 2014, our work will continue to be informed by the three research questions mentioned above. We also intend to continue to harness the potential of a variety of bodies of knowledge that are generally neglected when it comes to reflection on global cooperation. Our overall aim remains that of contributing to a new narrative on global cooperation – one that takes into account the cooperative properties of the human species. Areas of particular interest over the coming year will be multilateral negotiations and multi-disciplinary approaches to the study of what we term the ‘meso level’ of global cooperation. We aim to explore the full range of methodological approaches – including experiment, modelling, participant observation, and content analysis – across different disciplines. Amongst the more high-profile cases we shall look at in this connection are the negotiations to develop a new international climate change agreement and those aimed at defining a new generation of development goals.
One of the focal points of the Masterclass on complexity organized by the Centre in August 2013 was the issue of global social identity. In this connection, Grimalda’s project draws on a large-scale experimental study to analyse the interplay between global social identity, the propensity for cooperation at different levels, the degree of exposure to globalization processes, and the extent of country-level global integration. His findings provide insights into the (im)possibility of global ‘we-identities’ acting as drivers of global cooperation. In another strand of his research, he considers the optimal allocation of rights and duties in the context of negotiation over the provision of (global) public goods. In addition, he is involved in original experimental research – carried out jointly with Marlies Ahlert, Senior Fellow at the Centre, Sayantan Ghosal of Glasgow University, and Till Requate of Kiel University – which aims to improve our understanding of the prospects for, and barriers to, climate-change cooperation in the area of emissions and the transfer of technology.

Siddharth Mallavarapu is Assistant Professor of International Relations at the University of Delhi. His association with the Centre began in June 2013, when he took up a three-month fellowship in Research Unit 1. The project on which he worked during that time – ‘Cognitive Studies and Institutional Designs for Cooperation’ – cross-linked recent developments in the field of cognitive neuroscience with designs for institutions aimed at furthering human cooperation. The study considered in particular which types of institutional arrangement are most conducive to global cooperation. Touching as they do on various facets of international political life – notably the ‘human factor’ in global cooperation – cognitive studies offer us exciting new ways of looking at some of our core assumptions in this area.

The overall aim of the study was to analyse the potential implications of recent developments in cognitive studies and to draw on these to enrich thinking on questions of cooperation. More specifically, Mallavarapu looked at phenomena such as language-register, perception, preference-formation, ‘heuristics and biases’, trust, reciprocity, diversity, classic collective-action issues, and temporal dimensions, with a view to establishing how differences of emphasis impact on institutional design – and hence also on political outcomes.

In terms of the overall aim of Research Unit 1 – namely, to develop models of cooperation – the ultimate purpose of the study is to embed insights from cognitive studies within practical institutional designs that may evolve at the global level.

What is the state of world peace and what are its prospects at a time of shifting global power? This was the ambitious question which the Centre helped to explore in a conference devised by Lothar Brock, Senior Expert Fellow at the Centre, and held jointly with the Federation of German Scientists (Vereinigung Deutscher Wissenschaftler), the Protestant Academy Frankfurt (Evangelische Akademie Frankfurt), and the German Foundation for Peace Research (Deutsche Stiftung Friedensforschung). Entitled ‘Between Destabilization and Pluralization: Peace amidst Global Power Shifts’, the conference, held at the Martin Niemöller House in Arnoldshain from 6 to 8 December 2013, brought together expert scholars and practitioners from the field of peace politics.

The conference took as its point of departure the positive outlook of the 1990s in regard to the possibility of civilizing world politics and the fact that, as we enter the twenty-first century, renewed shifts in the international balance of power are putting these kinds of Western-liberal models of world order and global cooperation under increasing pressure.

The first session opened with a critical assessment of the European Union as a peace order. One recurring theme throughout the conference was the role of civil society and its failure to fulfill scholarly expectations that it would become the driving force of a more civilized, democratized world order during the 1990s – not just in the European context, but within an emerging global public sphere.

The tension between certain recurrent geopolitical trends and the growth in strength of global governance became apparent in a number of the sessions, a case in point being the stark contrast between the notion of a re-militarization of world politics and the normative development of international law. The discussions pointed to the continuing expansion of US drone warfare as a warning of the emergence of increasingly repressive elements in contemporary world politics. Assessing the post-Cold War peace dividend, participants from the fields of peace and conflict research and international law explored topics such as international norms against war, norms regarding the protection of civilians during conflict (‘responsibility to protect’), the International Criminal Court and its African critics, and non-violent approaches to conflict-management. One area of tension that made itself felt across the board was the contrary pull between peace and justice.

Against the backdrop of growing criticism of Western approaches to world politics, and the impact this is having on cosmopolitan endeavours, participants considered various examples of cooperative infrastructure aimed at promoting peace. Entities such as the United Nations, regional orders, subnational initiatives, and church-based peace and development networks were assessed in terms of their capacity to address urgent global challenges.

Despite the many competing and contradictory trends in world politics documented by participants, the conference closed on a positive note. Peace-based infrastructure at a variety of levels was noted to be displaying a growing resilience and it was felt that, although still rudimentary and imperfect, such infrastructure could help obviate conflict – not only amongst major powers but also within world society.
Culture and Cooperation: Exploring a Complex Relationship

Key Questions

Research Unit 2 – ‘Global Cultural Conflicts and Transcultural Cooperation’ – takes as its focus the question of how cultural and religious beliefs and world-views affect global cooperation. The general language and specific terminology of global cooperation are not neutral but culturally embedded, and one of the goals of our Unit is to examine the cultural meanings at the heart of different narratives and practices of cooperation. More specifically, we analyse: 1. situations in which global and transnational conflicts prove difficult to resolve because they are interpreted and experienced as ‘cultural’; and 2. the preconditions for successful transcultural cooperation. Our basic tenet is that culture can be both an intensifier of conflicts and a resource for conflict resolution and cooperation.

Culture occupies an ambiguous position in relation to the phenomenon of cooperation. It is often seen as a source of ‘sameness’, giving rise to an unquestioned set of shared values and beliefs. It helps us to identify, and cooperate with, like-minded people. At the same time, there is evidence that cultural difference can be a basis of cooperation. To help map out the field addressed by our particular research unit, we suggest framing cooperative endeavours in politics and society in terms of two binary oppositions: successful and unsuccessful; normatively desirable and normatively undesirable. The position occupied by culture in these antithetical pairs is not immediately obvious.

Cooperation, like any other kind of sustained social interaction, does indeed require a degree of moral and affective underpinning – which we may term ‘thin’ culture. But to engage in it, actors (be they individuals, firms or states) do not need a shared morality or a shared cultural way of life; enlightened self-interest is enough. History is replete with examples of this: during the French and Indian War in eighteenth-century North America, the British were able to enlist the support of Mohawks despite stark cultural differences; after the conclusion of the Good Friday peace agreement, Catholics and Protestants in Northern Ireland managed to cooperate within various consociational frameworks; and currently, Iranians, Israelis, and others are cooperating in the development of SESAME – the Middle East’s first major international research centre, based in Jordan. In none of these cases did success in cooperation result from a pre-existing shared culture.

That said, a common culture, although not a prerequisite, can clearly also be an aid to successful cooperation. One only has to think of international terrorist organizations or other criminal groupings based on strong ideologies or ‘amoral familism’. The ‘thickness’ of a common culture suits cooperative efforts among the like-minded, but perhaps not among others.

Thus strong notions of culture may negatively affect the normative quality of the outcomes of cooperation. In order for cooperation to be both successful and normatively desirable, it may be necessary for those seeking to engage in it to transcend or ‘bracket off’ any notion of a ‘thick’ common culture.

The question is: what brings about this kind of self-reflective ‘bracketing-off’ of culture? May it be that the desire to seek cooperative solutions to pressing global problems is the product of societal learning processes? Or may it be that situational constraints force actors to cooperate. In certain circumstances (yet to be documented), successful and long-lasting cooperation among actors without a common culture may actually result in the creation of one.

Achievements in 2013

In 2013, we continued our conceptual and empirical research on the relationship between culture and global cooperation. A milestone was the workshop on ‘Concepts of Culture’ in February, co-organized by the Unit’s Fellows Christian Meyer and Morgan Brigg. We also intensified our explorations of empirical cases of successful cooperation. After the experimental collaboration with the Ruhrtriennale Festival of the Arts in 2012, which focused on modes of cooperation practiced by multicultural groups of artists, the Unit launched a second workshop in May on ‘Successful Cooperation’ dealing with models of cooperation in the new media, and the importance of gifting. In addition, we also organized a third workshop in August 2013 on varieties of the phenomenon of the ‘invisible hand’.

The fourth part of the workshop series on successful cooperation (9 – 10 December) returned to the debate on conditions and criteria of success in cooperative efforts. A number of seminal papers shed new light on this major issue. Thilo Marauhn and Ignaz Stegmiller presented their research on the International Criminal Court, Gerhard Drolshagen from the European Space Agency gave the participants fascinating insights into how cooperation between professionals and amateurs helps monitoring the threat from asteroids and other ‘near-earth objects’. Senior Expert Fellow and former Director for Global Programs & Partnerships at the World Bank Margret Thalwitz presented examples from development partnerships. Lother Brock reconsidered the UN against the background of the question of successful and unsuccessful cooperation. Andrew Cooper asked if G-20 and BRICS could be considered successful informal mechanisms of cooperation.

The Way Ahead

In the medium term, Research Unit 2 will be focusing on global humanitarianism and on the anthropological subject of gift-giving in the contemporary world. We view gifts – from everyday compliments to donations, debt cancellation, and foreign aid – not as cooperative practices in themselves but as potential stepping-stones to cooperation. Modern practices of gifting often do not result in the establishment of cooperative relations between givers and receivers: consider post mortem organ-donation, for example, or the dropping of high-calorie foods over Afghanistan by the US Air Force. At the same time, gift theorists in the tradition of Marcel Mauss are right to emphasize that the ‘order of the gift’ is as real and ubiquitous as the ‘order of commerce’ (M. Hénaff), though grossly underappreciated.

Much of our future research will be devoted to examining the complex relationship between these two orders and to analysing gratuitous gift-giving as a technique for accumulating prestige, as a means of establishing social status, or restoring mutual recognition between societies, and as a topic through which we can shed new light on contemporary debates – about the boundaries between cooperation, collusion, and corruption, for example, or about the cohesion of diasporas and the resolution of sovereign debt crises in international society.
The theme of Morgan Brigg’s research during his time at the Centre, from March to November 2013, was ‘Culture as “Relational Resource” for Conflict Resolution and Global Cooperation’. The project contributed to developing trans-cultural cooperation by theorising the ‘relational’ dimensions of culture, beginning from the ways in which cultural difference is formed in relationship and yet is no less significant for being formed in this way. It recalibrated existing ways of knowing culture by turning its apparent unknowability to an advantage rather than a problem to be solved, including by engaging with non-western ways of knowing and worldviews. In this way the research showed that culture is a crucial yet frequently overlooked phenomenon in the pursuit of global cooperation, and extends the basis for viewing cultural difference as a resource rather than a problem in conflict resolution.

Whilst at the Centre, he co-organized a number of workshops, including: ‘Culture, Life and Critique’ (23 April), ‘How WEIRD are we? Implications for Cooperation Research’ (28 May), and ‘Cooperation For Hybrid Peace and Order: Selfhood and Socio-political Order Beyond Individualism and Collectivism’ (18 November).

Birger Priddat (University of Witten/Herdecke) explored the impact of Big Data on the consumer process – for example through the use of algorithms to work out what online shoppers ‘might also like’. Rather than feeling spied on – this was Priddat’s provocative thesis – we feel affirmed by the image of ourselves reflected in the statistics. We find the ‘personal service’ rather flattering and regard it as a kind of gift. Could it be, he asked, that in the midst of a hypermodern market-process we find ourselves reverting to the practices of a gift economy?

Theo Röhle (University of Paderborn) reflected on the ambigious nature of social emergence. Historical accounts of crowd behaviour – such as Le Bon’s crowd psychology – warned of the evaporation of individual responsibility in the context of the crowd, transforming the latter into a dangerous entity driven by primitive instincts. In our own day, by contrast, there has been a widespread surge in trust vis-à-vis the power of ‘invisible hands’, and digital-media theory is rethinking the masses in terms of ‘swarms’ or ‘smart mobs’. Therefore Röhle asked: ‘Where did this surge in trust come from and is it justified?’

The symposium was followed by ‘Massive Attack v Adam Curtis’ – a musical entertainment staged in the former Kraftzentrale (central power plant) as part of the Ruhrtriennale programme of events. This unusual show offered ‘The Kraftzentrale (central power plant) as part of the Ruhrtriennale Festival of the Arts’ – for example through the use of algorithms to work out what online shoppers ‘might also like’. Rather than feeling spied on – this was Priddat’s provocative thesis – we feel affirmed by the image of ourselves reflected in the statistics. We find the ‘personal service’ rather flattering and regard it as a kind of gift. Could it be, he asked, that in the midst of a hypermodern market-process we find ourselves reverting to the practices of a gift economy?

Theo Röhle (University of Paderborn) reflected on the ambigious nature of social emergence. Historical accounts of crowd behaviour – such as Le Bon’s crowd psychology – warned of the evaporation of individual responsibility in the context of the crowd, transforming the latter into a dangerous entity driven by primitive instincts. In our own day, by contrast, there has been a widespread surge in trust vis-à-vis the power of ‘invisible hands’, and digital-media theory is rethinking the masses in terms of ‘swarms’ or ‘smart mobs’. Therefore Röhle asked: ‘Where did this surge in trust come from and is it justified?’

The symposium was followed by ‘Massive Attack v Adam Curtis’ – a musical entertainment staged in the former Kraftzentrale (central power plant) as part of the Ruhrtriennale Festival of the Arts. This unusual show offered spectators an opportunity to rethink and re-experience phenomena such as power, cybernetics, control, and subversion, offered up in the synaesthetic fusion of Massive Attack’s live music and film-maker Adam Curtis’s dizzying visions.
New Perspectives on Global Governance

Key Questions

Research Unit 3 – ‘Global Governance Revisited’ – explores governance beyond the nation state from both the analytical and the normative point of view, evaluating the potential impact of nascent processes of global change on the prospects for cooperation. We use the concept of governance here on the basis that authoritative decision-making with the potential to influence the behaviour of actors does not necessarily presuppose the existence of a government capable of steering affairs hierarchically. It also allows us the flexibility to address not only the empirical issue of what governance structures are already in existence or are currently emerging, but also normative aspects such as the legitimacy of particular structures and procedures of governance and the justness and fairness of specific policies.

Two particular developments in global governance, and the effects of these, are of special interest to us. The first is the inclusion of non-Western perspectives on global order. After centuries of global dominance by European and North American powers, the rise of China and India, but also of a number of other countries, is attracting increasing public attention. The implications of this development, however, are still poorly understood. In the context of a steady growth in the economic and military might of non-Western countries, what is happening to the patterns of interaction within a system long dominated by the West? And what impact is this trend having on the actors themselves? One special focus of attention here is non-Western discourse on global order as a whole or on specific aspects of it.

The second trend of particular interest to us is the increasing participation of non-state actors in international negotiations. Transnational NGOs are gaining access to negotiating arenas that have long been the preserve of states; multi-national corporations are now a force to be reckoned with in many policy fields; and the power of private credit-rating agencies has in some cases already evolved as a clear-cut, uniform trend towards de-nationalization and de-Westernization. One reason for this is the sensitivity of powers such as China, India, and Brazil in regard to loss of sovereignty. Which of the two tendencies – globalization-induced de-nationalization or non-Western pro-Westphalian aspirations to re-nationalization – will carry the day remains to be seen. Study of both trends in conjunction focuses our attention on a series of questions crucial to the future development of world politics.

Research Unit 3 approaches these issues from three different angles. First, we ask what structures and processes of global governance have already evolved or are in the process of evolving, what structures and processes are needed to cope with global problems, and how emerging institutions can be evaluated normatively. Complementing this macro perspective will be a more meso approach involving reflection on the role of political and professional cultures in international negotiations. (A micro approach, focusing on the nature and motivation of individual actors, would fall outside our primary area of interest.) In a last step, macro and meso approaches will be combined to provide a dynamic overview of the potential which these trends offer for new modes of cooperation and of the ways in which that potential can be realized.

Achievements in 2013

Work towards these goals during 2013 has included a wide range of contributions from the staff and fellows of the Research Unit. Making his contribution to the macro view on global governance, Esref Aksu offered a critical review of the notion of globality in research on global governance. Both Meibo Huang and Stephen Brown looked at changing structures and processes in one particular field of global governance – development cooperation. Whereas Stephen Brown focused on policy coherence in the endeavours of traditional donors, Meibo Huang turned her attention to Chinese perspectives on the concept of development cooperation. Herbert Wulf pursued his research on India’s global aspirations, with input from the Centre’s Director, Tobias Debiel. Mathieu Rousselin addressed the subject of environmental politics, focusing in particular on legitimacy in environmental governance. Jan Aart Scholte’s contributions to our work on global governance included an analysis of the role of civil society and non-state actors in global finance and the organization of a major workshop on the prerequisites and prospects for intercultural cooperation. Permanent staff-members also made their contributions to the research in this area. Besides joining other scholars on a field-trip to India, to study the Indian approach to global governance, Tobias Debiel co-organized, along with David Chandler, a workshop on the theme of governance in a world of complexity. Rainer Baumann continued his project on the inclusion of non-state actors in state delegations to international conferences, and, together with Frank Gadinger and Tobias Debiel, organized and hosted one of the ‘Sections’ – ‘Democratizing World Society’ – at the 8th Pan-European Conference on International Relations, in Warsaw. In addition to a number of Centre fellows, this featured researchers from the wider academic community in Duisburg and various external colleagues.

The Way Ahead

In 2014, we will continue our work on patterns of global governance, looking in particular at non-state actors and non-Western discourse. With regard to the macro and meso perspectives highlighted above, we will direct our focus slightly more towards the meso level, taking a closer look at international negotiations.
Stephen Brown, Professor of Political Science at the University of Ottawa, Canada, held a Senior Fellowship at the Centre from January to June 2013. His key areas of research include: foreign aid, democratization, African politics, political violence, peacebuilding, and transitional justice. His chosen subject of study whilst at the Centre was ‘Global Cooperation and Development-Policy Coherence’. Representing the initial stage of a five-year research programme, this project focused on the role of donor country cooperation in development policy, with a view to elucidating policy coherence, incoherence, and hierarchy in this area.

Given his particular interest in Kenya and the Kenyan presidential elections of March 2013, it was natural that he should be involved in the Käte Hamburger Dialogue Programme, this project focused on the role of donor country cooperation in development policy, with a view to elucidating policy coherence, incoherence, and hierarchy in this area.

Stephen Brown, Professor of Political Science at the University of Ottawa, Canada, held a Senior Fellowship at the Centre from January to June 2013. His key areas of research include: foreign aid, democratization, African politics, political violence, peacebuilding, and transitional justice. His chosen subject of study whilst at the Centre was ‘Global Cooperation and Development-Policy Coherence’. Representing the initial stage of a five-year research programme, this project focused on the role of donor country cooperation in development policy, with a view to elucidating policy coherence, incoherence, and hierarchy in this area.

Mathieu Rousselin joined the Centre as an Associate Postdoctoral Fellow in January 2013, having recently completed his doctoral studies at the University of St Gallen. His period of study at the Centre was made possible by a twelve-month research fellowship awarded by the Swiss National Science Foundation.

Whilst at the Centre, Rousselin worked on two research projects. The first, on the theme of the legitimacy of global environmental governance, fell within the remit of Research Unit 3 – ‘Global Governance Revisited’; the second, smaller in scope, concerned processes of democratization in the Mediterranean region and formed part of the province of Research Unit 4 – ‘Paradoxes and Perspectives of Democratization’. Resultant publications included, in the first case, articles in the peer-reviewed Journal of Contemporary European Research and European Foreign Affairs Review, and a further text under consideration by Environmental Policy and Governance. In relation to the second area of research, he guest-edited a special issue of Euxinosis on the theme of Turkish soft power, contributing an article of his own on the influence of Turkish television ‘soaps’ in the Middle East. A commentary by him on Prime Minister Erdoğan’s visit to Tunisia was published (in German) in the journal WeltTrends and a further piece on the World Social Forum in Tunisia (in French) has been submitted for publication by the journal Multitudes.

Rousselin also helped to organize and deliver a number of doctoral seminars that took place in Tunisia as part of the project ‘Tunisia in Transition’, funded by the German Academic Exchange Service and jointly run by the universities of Munich and Passau and five of their Tunisian counterparts.

Topics addressed in the various publications produced by Stephen Brown whilst at the Centre include: aid-allocation patterns, the securitization of foreign aid, donor behaviour in Kenya, Canadian foreign-aid policy, and Canadian-African relations.

InHouse & Guests Workshop: ‘Building a Global Partnership? Development Cooperation East/West/South’

A workshop on inter-regional development cooperation took place at the Centre on 2 August 2013, as part of the ‘InHouse&Guests’ series. The event, run jointly with the German Development Institute/Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE) and the University of Duisburg-Essen’s Institute For Development and Peace, was organized by two of the Centre’s Senior Fellows: Meibo Huang and Stephen Brown. In addition to colleagues from the DIE and the University of Duisburg-Essen (UDE), guests included international expert Emma Mawdsley of Cambridge University.

The workshop was made up of six sessions. Following a short welcome address by Brown and Huang, the meeting opened with a session on the coordination of EU aid. A paper entitled ‘EU Joint Programming: Lessons from South Sudan for EU Aid Coordination’ was presented by Frank Vollmer of the DIE and this was followed by a response from his DIE colleague Sebastian Paulo. Moderating the discussion was Christof Hartmann of the UDE.

The second session, moderated by the Centre’s Director Tobias Deibel, saw Christine Hackenesch of the DIE engage in debate with Meibo Huang on the question ‘How to Engage with the Tiger and the Dragon? Rwanda’s Relations with China and India’. The distinctive features of Chinese–African relations were examined in detail, with particular attention being paid to the case of Rwanda.

Emma Mawdsley’s paper on ‘Non-DAC Development Partners and Humanitarian Assistance’ provided the focal point for the third-session debate between the author herself and Christine Hackenesch. Mawdsley’s presentation focused on the different ways in which various ‘emerging powers’ are engaging with the international humanitarian system – both bilaterally and multilaterally – and the extent to which these approaches reflect, or depart from, the wider discourses, modalities, and motivations of South–South development partnership. The debate was moderated by Marlies Ahlert, Senior Fellow at the Centre.

The focal point for session 4 – entitled ‘Triangular Cooperation: A Feasible Path to Promote Global Partnership for Development’ and moderated by Morgan Brigg, Senior Fellow at the Centre – was the paper presented by Meibo Huang, which posited triangular cooperation as an important bridge between North–South and South–South cooperation. The respondent in this session was Emma Mawdsley.

Session 5 focused on the effectiveness of aid and international cooperation. Using myth as an analytical yardstick, Elena Sondernann of the UDE, in a paper entitled ‘Myths of the Near Future: The Paris Declaration, Development Terminologies and Tales of Aid Effectiveness’, reviewed the debate on aid effectiveness initiated by the OECD’s Development Assistance Committee (DAC). The respondent in this session was Frank Vollmer, and the moderators, as in the closing session, were Abou Jeng, Postdoc Fellow at the Centre, and Cornelia Ulbert of the UDE.

The final session saw Sebastian Paulo engage in debate with Elena Sondernann on his presentation ‘Patterns of International Cooperation: A Macro-perspective on Development Cooperation’. The ‘macro-perspective’ referred to in Sebastian Paulo’s paper related not to specific features of development cooperation as a policy area but to the politie and politics of international cooperation.
Contested Notions of Democratization around the World

Key Questions

Research Unit 4 – ‘Paradoxes and Perspectives of Democratization’ – is concerned with the manifold links between democracy, democratization, and cooperation in the context of globalization. It looks at the ways in which the contested normative concept of democracy, and real-world processes of democratization, impact upon global cooperation. As part of this process, it points up both the opportunities and the challenges which democracy and democratization create for global cooperation. Rather than simply positing democratization as the only normative path to global cooperation amongst the plurality of political actors involved, the Unit seeks to identify not only the possibilities it offers in diverse cultural contexts, but also the ambiguities and paradoxes that attend it in such situations. Why does democracy appear increasingly appealing to people around the world? What form might global democracy take? What role does democracy play in global cooperation – both as a normative concept and as a mode of governance? How do legitimacy claims play out across cultural difference? And how do such claims resonate in transnational conflicts involving, for example, Western interventionism, peacebuilding operations, or the global financial crisis?

In tackling these challenging questions, we use political controversies (in the broad sense) as analytical entry-points for an exploration of legitimacy-conflicts in global cooperation. Underlying our investigations is the premise that global politics can be understood as a struggle between claims to legitimacy that are rooted in differing cultural contexts. To understand differing perceptions and cultural notions of democratization, we need to engage in an in-depth analysis of the politics of legitimation – in other words, the interplay between justification and critique in political life – as it figures in transnational conflicts associated with global cooperation. Clearly, in methodological terms, an undertaking such as this is deeply rooted in the interpretive approach.

In line with contemporary debates in political science and cultural studies, the research programme avoids essentialist notions of democracy and culture. Thinking within a framework of transnational politics necessitates moving beyond the traditional presumption of a causal connection between nation-state and cultural homogeneity. Whereas modernization theory interpreted democracy and democratization as the principal motors to political progress and cooperation, social science scholars across all disciplines are now more sceptical and stress the ambiguous nature of democracy. Democracy can be used as a normative principle to justify many different political acts – from the ‘democratic wars’ of Western interventionism to political claims concerning a ‘responsibility to protect’ human rights. Nor does democracy automatically promote cooperation – indeed, it may exacerbate conflict.

Research Unit 4 aspires to an interdisciplinary approach in tackling these issues, drawing variously on domains such as international relations, political theory, sociology, and cultural studies. This approach makes possible a broad complementarity with the Centre’s other research units, a case in point being our collaborative projects with Research Unit 2, tying in with its interest in culture and humanitarianism.

Achievements in 2013

In the Unit’s first year of operation (2012–13), researchers reflected on core political concepts such as democratic legitimacy, governance, and global democracy, drawing on sources in philosophy, social theory, and sociology. This was reflected in the second Global Cooperation Research Paper, Rethinking the Legitimacy of Global Governance: On the Need for Sociological Research and Philosophical Foundations, published in 2013, which brought together some of the results of these earlier theoretical and methodological discussions. During 2013, the Unit has continued the conceptual work begun in its first year, developing ideas and advancing the debate about new forms of governance and resilience in a world of complexity and about the changing notion of critique in the politics of the everyday. (A workshop on complexity was held in June 2013.) A second major theme for the Unit in 2013 was the critical debate on the promises and pitfalls of peacebuilding as an example of complex joint action in the field of global cooperation. Researchers sought to combine conceptual thinking – in the dynamic sense of relationally and culturally sensitive frameworks – with practical knowledge and experience of peacebuilding field-work. Early findings from these ongoing discussions were published in the second issue of the Global Dialogues series: Relational Sensibility and the ‘Turn to the Local’: Prospects for the Future of Peacebuilding. The Unit aims to advance the rather stagnant debate of the last few decades on the shortfalls of ‘liberal peacebuilding’. It seeks to do this by promoting discussion about the ways in which modes of engagement and interaction in peacebuilding might be reshaped critically.

The Way Ahead

Further initiatives in 2014 will address: global cooperation in the transitional justice debate; critique and resistance in our modern age; the notions of territoriality, borders, and boundaries in globalization; the role of Islamic parties in the democratization of Tunisia and Egypt; and, lastly, the ambiguities of democratization in cases such as those of Mali and the Democratic Republic of the Congo. The empirical focus of the Unit’s case-study research will lie in West Africa.

There are three interlinking strands to the Unit’s work and these will continue to guide us as we take our research forward:

a. Practices and narratives of democratization in Africa and the Middle East
b. Rethinking legitimacy and the role of critique in emerging forms of global governance
c. Examples of global cooperation: interventionism, peacebuilding, global financial crisis, and regional perspectives.
Abou Jeng took up a twelve-month post-doctoral fellowship in Research Unit 4 in June 2013. His research interests include: human rights, governance and constitutionalism; globalization; international law; democracy; memory; and transitional justice.

His project at the Centre focuses on memory, human rights, and democratization in West Africa. Its main gist is that recent transitional processes in West Africa have generally been rushed through, under the guise of cooperation, and have almost certainly not taken account of the systemic injustices and violations of rights that have pervaded most of the region’s recent post-colonial history. As a result, argues Jeng, the national constitutional frameworks that provided the legal bases for these transitions have been disproportionately skewed in favour of the maintenance of order and stability rather than the provision of justice and closure for the victims of the atrocities and rights violations that occurred in former times. In a series of case studies on the Gambia, Ghana, Sierra Leone, and Liberia, Jeng explores the inconsistencies and paradoxes of the democratic transition process. He highlights the institutional and normative deficiencies of transitional democracies, the impoverished visions of democracy at the national and global level, the role of global cooperation in the interpretation of democratic transition, and the points at which memory, human rights, and democracy converge.

Initiatives in which Abou Jeng has been involved during his fellowship include a presentation at the Human Security and Humanitarianism conference in Istanbul, in October 2013, and participation in a panel on post-development at the University of Duisburg-Essen in early November 2013 – in both cases alongside Centre colleague Morgan Brigg, Senior Fellow in Research Unit 2. Jeng also co-organized, again with Morgan Brigg, a workshop on ‘Cooperation for Hybrid Peace and Order: Selfhood and Socio-political Order Beyond Individualism and Collectivism’, which took place at the Centre on 18 November 2013.

Jeng’s work at the Centre will form the basis of a book, which he plans to complete over the next year.

Reflecting her interest in areas of intersection between political theory and international relations, Schmidt’s research project at the Centre examines the rationales behind the international promotion of democracy in the Global South and the views of democratization that underpin these. Entitled ‘Crisis of Legitimacy and the Rise of Democracy as Social Form: The Growing Importance of Democratic Governance Support in the Global South’, the project focuses on various changes – in the notion of political transformation, in the sites and objects of governing, and in processes of decision-making. Its overall objective is to explore the dislocation caused to democracy by the current multi-dimensional crisis affecting legitimacy, authority, politics, and the Subject, and to assess the changes this has brought to the notion of democracy as it figures in the discourses and practices of international policy-making. Two areas of special interest in the study are the ‘local turn’ and, as its title indicates, the rise of democracy as social form.

During her fellowship, she plans to rework her Ph.D. thesis as a book, to be published under the title ‘From Artifice to Life: Democracy Promotion and the Rise of the Social’. In addition, she is working on two articles on resilience discourses and the idea of hybrid peacebuilding. Jessica Schmidt is also involved in the organization of a Centre workshop on the current state of critique – ‘After Modernity, into Complexity: Possibilities for Critique in an Age of Global Cooperation’.

A two-day workshop entitled ‘Rethinking Governance in a World of Complexity’ took place at the Centre from 27 to 28 June 2013. Organized at the suggestion of Senior Fellow David Chandler, the workshop opened with the 6th Käte Hamburger Lecture – ‘Rethinking State Power and Governance in a World of Complexity’ – delivered by Bob Jessop, Professor of Sociology at the University of Lancaster. Providing the response to Jessop’s lecture was Jonathan Joseph of the University of Sheffield. Intended as an opportunity to deepen the debate on complexity and resilience in relation to governance, the workshop explored both the emergence of different ways of understanding complexity and the concomitant rise of discourses centring on resilience and adaptation. Complexity thinking reflects an understanding of the world that rejects direct causal relations and instead posits non-linear change, interconnectivity, and unintended consequence as the starting point for rationalization. Discussion during the workshop centred on the implications of such thinking when it comes to modes of governance. The spotlight was turned, in particular, on the relation between neoliberal governance and complexity/resilience-based perspectives and on the changing views of risk and uncertainty that underpin complexity thinking.

The first panel discussion – on the theme ‘Embedded Governance and Bureaucratic Vitalism in Complex Societies’ – opened with a paper by Adrian Hyde-Price of the University of Bath. Entitled ‘Governance in Late Modern Europe: A Strategic-Relational Approach’, this sought to lay the groundwork for a holistic theory of governance. Stephanie Simon of the University of Amsterdam, speaking on the theme ‘Bureaucratic Vitalism and the Interconnected Cyber-emergency’, described various approaches employed by European bureaucracy to manage cyber-security.

The central theme of the second panel discussion was resilience. Jonathan Joseph’s paper ‘Building Resilience as a Distant Form of Governance’ brought together the concepts of resilience and governmentality via a case study of European Union intervention in the Horn of Africa. Claudia Aradau of King’s College, London, turned her attention to the contemporary ‘gospel of resilience’ – in which resilience figures as the answer to a whole range of problems of governance – and to the advance of discourse in this area from ‘resilience as dead end’ to ‘resilience as a bridging concept’.

The second day of the workshop opened with a panel discussion on ‘Resilience, Vulnerability, and Adaptation: New Perspectives on Security Research’. The paper presented by Giorgio Shani of the International Christian University, Tokyo, explored the connections between human security and resilience, whilst Mareile Kaufmann of the Peace Research Institute Oslo reviewed the EU’s Security Strategy, noting in particular the coexistence within this of basic risk-assessment and resilient responses to emergencies. Drawing on two case studies on non-violent communities, in Nigeria and Indonesia, Jana Krause of the German Institute of Global and Area Studies in Hamburg spoke on the theme of non-violence as legitimation, in the sense of (evolutionary) social resilience.

This third and final panel was followed by a ‘stock-taking’ session, with suggestions by Jessica Schmidt of the University of Westminster and Ulrich Schneckener of the University of Osnabrück as to how governance research might be reframed. The workshop closed with a ‘round table’ on the theme ‘From Regulation to Resilience? New Perspectives on Governing Complexity’, with further input from David Chandler and responses by Bob Jessop, Mareile Kaufmann, Jana Krause, and Giorgio Shani.
Cherries on the Cake: Selected Events
On 13 – 15 November 2013 the Centre for Global Cooperation Research hosted a workshop on ‘Transcultural Constructions of Global Legitimacy’. The event was part of a series of workshops in the context of the Building Global Democracy Programme (BGD). Jan Aart Scholte, alumnus Senior Fellow of the Centre, is also one of the convenors of BGD. The workshop explored the question of how cultural diversity can be negotiated in such a way that the various parties can all give positive consent to global governance arrangements.

The concept paper for the workshop introduced an approach dubbed ‘transculturalism’, with principles such as reflectivity, recognition of complexity, celebration of diversity, humility, deep listening, reciprocal learning, and perpetual change. The workshop invited experts from different regions of the world, different academic disciplines and different ideological perspectives, to broaden the debate on global cooperation through transculturalism.

Participants in the project include Ahmed Badawi from Egypt (Tranform e.V.), Lynn Mario T. Menezes de Souza from Brazil (University of São Paulo), Sitiveni Halapua from Tonga (East-West Center, Hawaii), Charity Musamba from Zambia (governmental consultant), Zeynep Sezgin (University of Vienna, Austria), Paul Tjon Sie Fat from Suriname, Shiv Visvanathan from India (O. P. Jindal Global University) and Xuedong Yang from China (China Center for Global Governance and Development Strategies, CCCPCE). Unfortunately Karen Busby from Canada (University of Manitoba) and Nadejda Fedotova from Russia (MGIMO-University) could not come to the workshop but will participate in the publication project.

On Wednesday, 13 November, the participants started a lively debate on their different concepts of culture, the role of power with regard to cultural diversity and the problem of incommensurability between different cultural positions.

On the second day the debate focused more on the concept of transculturalism. In the course of the discussion, four strategies were identified to deal with cultural complexity in global cooperation. The first strategy would leave the institutions of global governance as they are, as they provide enough space for cultural diversity. In terms of the second strategy, international institutions and actors could be sensitized for cultural diversity. The third strategy would entail a decentralization of the execution of global policies to regional, national and local institutions, which can better attend to cultural diversity. The fourth strategy would take a transformational approach and build up a completely new system of global cooperation. The participants discussed the advantages and disadvantages of the four strategies as well as their practicability.

In the afternoon the participants and fellows of the Centre visited the Merkez Mosque in Duisburg-Marxloh, a local example of cultural diversity and interreligious dialogue.

On the final day the workshop group further debated trust and empathy in relation to politics of cultural diversity. Further questions, like ‘how much space is available for different cultures within global culture?’ and ‘how can transcultural principles be sustainable?’, were also discussed.

At the end of the workshop participants, staff and fellows from the Centre as well as representatives of the University of Duisburg-Essen and of the City of Duisburg were invited to a mayoral reception at the town hall of Duisburg. In his welcome address Mayor Sören Link underlined the cultural diversity of Duisburg and wondered about the applicability of transculturalist principles for the city. The Vice Chancellor for Diversity Management of the University of Duisburg-Essen, Ute Klammer, also welcomed the participants, as did Tobias Debiel from the Centre. Scholte and one of the participants, Charity Musamba, summarized the discussions during the workshop.
Towards a Better Understanding of Complexity and Scale and Their Relevance for Global Cooperation

30–31 August 2013, Blowerhouse Complex at Landschaftspark Duisburg-Nord

Martin Nowak (Harvard University) speaking at the 1st Masterclass Retreat

The Masterclass event was at the heart of the interdisciplinary agenda of Research Unit 1 ‘The (Im) Possibility of Cooperation’ in 2013. It succeeded with bringing different disciplines, methods and vocabularies into conversation with each other, in order to make theorising about global cooperation more fruitful. The conference brought together leading experts from across a wide field of disciplines, such as Evolutionary Biology, Behavioural Economics, Decision Science, Psychology, and Political Science. The aim was to gather new insights about the foundations of (global) cooperation with a view to developing ideas of how to make a more successful cooperation possible. The Ruhrtriennale – Festival of the Arts provided a fascinating cultural and intellectual frame for the event.

How deeply anchored are the roots of cooperation in human nature? How fundamental a mechanism is cooperation for the evolution of life on our planet? How do human beings cognitively deal with complexity? How much do we understand about the complexity of our planetary systems? These and similar questions provided ample fuel for an intellectually exiting journey. The intellectual starting point was the ‘cooperation hexagon’, which humans use shortcuts to cope with the complexity of (social) situations. Taking issue with rational choice theory, they argued that rational choice theory was only of limited help here, providing incomplete answers at best, being misleading and counterproductive at worst. According to them, barriers to cooperation might not be as severe as previously suggested by many economists.

Jürgen Kurths, Head of the Research Domain Transdisciplinary Concepts and Methods, Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research, and a Professor of Nonlinear Dynamics at the Institute of Physics at Humboldt University, Berlin, took a different approach to the issue of complexity. He provided insights on the latest trends in modeling complex systems and networks. This dynamic field of science allows for the uncovering of relations and patterns that so far have remained in the dark. Such an approach, made possible by technological innovation, has a lot to offer for a better understanding of global problems and global cooperation.

As a conclusion, Dirk Messner and Silke Weinlich underlined that the insights of behavioural sciences are in stark contrast to the predominant perceptions of cooperation being prone to failure as held in the discipline of international relations or in the public perception of global politics. They urged for a radical change of perspectives, in order to move beyond the narratives of the impossibility of global cooperation. In this vein, a multi-disciplinarity approach appears not only possible but more than promising, after all. The Masterclass provided an excellent kick-off for further interdisciplinary research at the Centre.
Global Governance and the State of Nuclear Weapons
12 June 2013, Haus der EKD, Gendarmenmarkt, Berlin

The global governance of nuclear security is standing on a cliff. Its recent evolution presents some inconsequential achievements and limited progress on hard cases. Although disarmament is considered the necessary precondition for the full implementation of other pillars (non-proliferation, nuclear security and peaceful ways of using nuclear energy), its progress is of the lowest level. In order to step forward, the perception of nuclear weapons as an essential element of national security posture needs to be reshaped and eventually abolished.

The agenda on nuclear disarmament has come to a standstill. This was the sombre assessment of Ramesh Thakur when he opened the 5th Käte Hamburger Lecture. In the lecture, jointly organized with the Development and Peace Foundation (SEF), Thakur mapped out the global governance of nuclear security, assessed the progress of recent commitments and drew his analysis on the current state of nuclear weapons. Thakur is currently the Director of the Centre for Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament at the Asia-Pacific College of Diplomacy of the Australian National University (ANU) in Canberra. Moreover, he is a former Vice-Rector of the United Nations University and Assistant Secretary-General of the United Nations.

Following the election of Obama and his visionary speeches in 2009, hopes for a nuclear free world had heightened. This optimism, however, was cut short by the lack of commitment to pursue the treaties. The number of nuclear weapons had indeed gone down over recent decades, Thakur said, but there were still almost 18,000 of them in existence – 2,000 available for rapid deployment. At the same time, the number of nuclear-armed states had risen to nine. And there is a risk that this figure would increase further if worldwide efforts at disarmament continued to fail to make significant progress.

Thakur’s presentation drew partly on the report ‘Nuclear Weapons: The State of Play’, published in April 2013 by the Centre for Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament and co-edited by Thakur himself and Professor Gareth Evans. The report concludes that the nuclear-weapon states have seen only paid lip-service to the idea of the definitive destruction of nuclear weapons and that any real breakthrough must still be awaited. In order to give a clear picture of how the possession, the use and the elimination of nuclear weapons are regulated at the global level, Thakur, in the second part of his lecture, presented the current global governance architecture of nuclear security:

- The Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty (NPT)
- The Nuclear Security Summits (NSS)
- The International Commission on Nuclear-Proliferation and Disarmament (ICNND) and the Centre of Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament (CNND)

Reflecting the progress of recent commitments, Thakur stated, declarations as had been made involved less ambiguous, easier to achieve targets (‘low-hanging fruits’) rather than negotiating successes. And even some of these, he said, were proving to have little follow-through. Thakur lay part of the blame for the lack of success on current conference-diplomacy: important issues are discussed at ministerial rather than head-of-state or head-of-government level who owe the necessary clout to push measures through. Thakur also acknowledged that some advances had been made in the area of non-proliferation, nuclear security, and the peaceful use of nuclear energy. However, as far as he was concerned, these were of little significance, since priority must be given to abolition. If we want nuclear non-proliferation, we have to be ready for nuclear disarmament, he said in closing his address.

Commenting on the lecture, Ambassador Rolf Nikel, Federal Government Commissioner For Disarmament and Arms Control, opposed the conclusions drawn by Thakur. Explaining the German government’s step-by-step approach, he stressed that the ultimate aim was still a nuclear-weapons-free world but that to achieve real progress required a great deal of patience. Disarmament, according to Ambassador Nikel, is being pursued. But the longer process of implementation owes to the effort to involve all nuclear-weapon states, without whom any commitment would be inconsequential.

The second discussant, Uta Zapf, Member of Parliament and Chair of the German parliament’s Sub-Committee on Disarmament, Arms Control, and Non-Proliferation, criticized the fact that dialogue with Russia over the elimination of tactical nuclear weapons from German territory had still not begun. As far as Zapf was concerned, different nuclear-armed states receive unequal attention and are treated differently by the international commissions. Agreeing with Thakur on the necessity to detach the concept of defence and national security from the possession of nuclear weapons, Uta Zapf stressed that this issue must under no circumstances disappear from the political agenda. And that it is important to raise awareness among citizens as well.

The plenary discussion that followed picked up the topics raised by the lecturer and the discussants: the role of NATO and Germany in non-proliferation; unequal treatment of international commissions towards different nuclear-armed states; and the balance between disarmament and the sense of security. Summing up the lecture Senior Expert Fellow Herbert Wulf, chairing the debate, critically questioned how small the steps can be with regard to the developments since the Non-Proliferation Treaty from 1968. Thereby he reflected the pessimistic impression about difficulties and stalled progress in global governance of nuclear weapons as shared by the participants, comprising of diplomats, politicians, academics and practitioners.
Democratic Interventionism and Local Legitimacy

22–23 May 2013, H2Office, Duisburg

Organized by the Käte Hamburger Kolleg/Centre for Global Cooperation politics and the nature of the state – models that are contested. 'local politics' frequently presuppose particular models of democratic interventionism in other cultural regions. ‘Democratic interventions’ into ‘local politics’ frequently presuppose particular models of democratic politics and the nature of the state – models that are contested.

After the end of the Cold War and twenty years of peacekeeping missions and peacebuilding interventions, scholars of peace and conflict have raised serious questions about the possibilities of Western democratic and peacebuilding interventions, scholars of peace and conflict have raised serious questions about the possibilities of Western democratic interventionism and peacebuilding interventions, human rights and cultural conflicts.

David Chandler (KHK/GCR21 Senior Fellow) framed the workshop discussions in his presentation which described a shift within the discourse of Democratization and peacebuilding where the underlying foundations of previous linear and teleological approaches were being questioned or discarded in favour of a more relational approach. Daniel Gaus (KHK/GCR21 Fellow) followed, providing a political philosophy perspective about the historical problem of democratic universalism. Further perspectives were presented by Lothar Brock (KHK/ GCR21 Senior Expert Fellow) who discussed the normative background of Democratization, the risks of framing peacebuilding interventions around perceived deficiencies and the need for self-reflectivity by interveners. Finally, Kristina Weissenbach (University of Duisburg-Essen) spoke about the consolidation of democracy through political parties and political institutions and the influence of Western interveners in this process.

To further develop the debate and discuss questions of practical implications to peacebuilding and research, a selection of participants presented short case studies from their work. Volker Boege (University of Queensland), Serge Loode (University of Queensland), Morgan Brigg (KHK/GCR21 Senior Fellow), Louise Wiuff Moe (University of Queensland), Hannah Neumann (University of Berlin) and Kai Roddenbrock (University of Bremen) presented their experiences and perceptions from their research work on the Pacific Island of Bougainville (Papua New Guinea), Vanuatu, Somalia, Liberia and the Democratic Republic of the Congo. These presentations dealt with questions of different perceptions and concepts of democracy and peacebuilding between the internationals, the local authorities and the population on the ground. It became clear that not only are the concepts very different but also the expectations and aims of the missions. The case studies described both challenges created by differences between the internationals and the locals and also different understandings and aims between the intervened-upon state and community. Furthermore, the presentations illustrated the enormous gap between abstract concepts of democracy, human rights, gender, development and the rule of law in research and the reality on the ground. The case studies offered revealing insights in the researchers’ lives, experiences and challenges in the field of intercultural peacebuilding and provided a thought-provoking basis for group discussions.

In order to provide a stimulating framework within which the different participants could interact and discuss cutting-edge approaches to research and policy-making, the workshop employed a highly interactive and innovative format. This included a mixture of large group interdisciplinary presentations and discussions as well as small group ‘World Café’ discussions and medium-sized group ‘Fishbowl’ discussions for a deeply engaged exchange on key puzzles that were identified during the workshop.

This workshop format created an intense working atmosphere. In lively debates, challenging questions for peacebuilding in practice and the academic discourse were raised. One key issue highlighted was the changing nature (through both discourse and practice) of the interaction between the ‘international’ and the ‘local’ in contexts of peacebuilding interventions. The workshop concluded with reflections on what might be the epistemological and methodological orientations that enable sustained engagement and/or viable, inclusive political community across significant differences. Finally, participants were invited to develop the ideas discussed during the workshop into short articles for publication. These articles were collated into an edition of Global Dialogues, published by the Centre under the title Relational Sensibility and the ‘Turn to the Local’: Prospects for the Future of Peacebuilding.
Elections, Violence and International Criminal Justice: The Case of Kenya

15 April 2013, German Development Institute / Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE), Bonn

About one month after Kenya’s 2013 elections the first Käte Hamburger Dialogue, organized in cooperation with the German Development Institute/Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE), brought together international experts to discuss its process and outcome. Uhuru Kenyatta, the newly elected president, will become the second office-holding president in Africa to face charges at the International Criminal Court (ICC). He and William Ruto are indicted by the ICC for committing crimes against humanity in the aftermath of the 2007 elections. In particular, the Dialogue focused on the relationship and possible trade-offs between domestic stability, democratic elections and international justice.

Chairled by Angelika Spelten, Senior Researcher at the Institute for Development and Peace (INEF), the Dialogue emerged as an insightful round of discussion on the recent political events in Kenya and their potential implications for the international community was composed of Ekuru Aukot, Advocate at the High Court of Kenya, former chairman of the selection panel that recruited the Independent Electoral and Boundaries Commission (IEBC) and former Director and ex-officio member of the Committee of Experts on the Review of the new Constitution of Kenya, Stephen Brown, Professor of Political Science at the University of Ottawa and Senior Fellow at the Centre, and Gabrielle Lynch, Associate Professor of Comparative Politics at the University of Warwick.

A political shift in Kenya

With regard to the kick-off question, whether the inauguration of newly elected President Kenyatta meant a new beginning for Kenya, Aukot stated that the country has been in a state of renewal since the promulgation of a new constitution in 2010. Instituting a new governance structure, Kenya is undergoing a legal and political transition. As to the topic of violence in Kenya, he expressed his astonishment about the degree of surprise in the international community at the relative peacefulness of the elections. Brown and Lynch, however, stated that the concern about post-elections violence was very well founded and that not only the international community but Kenyans themselves were worried about a new conflict. The outbreak of violence in 2007/08, which caused the death of around 1,500 people and the displacement of more than 600,000, took many by surprise – as a result, this time everyone was prepared for the worst.

The discussants of the 1st Käte Hamburger Dialogue: Angelika Spelten, Stephen Brown, Gabriella Lynch, Julia Leininger, and Ekuru Aukot

Peace vs. democracy?

In response to the chair’s second question on whether there are lessons to be learned from Kenya’s elections, Lynch asserted that the close monitoring of hate speech and the strategic location of security forces – factors that ensured relatively peaceful elections – are important for other countries. However, she emphatically stressed that peace is not the only criterion for successful elections. The credibility of the elections is of equal importance. In Kenya’s recent elections there emerged clear problems with the voting process, in particular with regard to technology and vote counting. Yet, since everyone was very concerned with not destabilising the country, only few dared asking critical questions. As a result, many Kenyans doubt that the elections were free and fair.

Democracy vs. international criminal justice?

While the three panelists agreed on the fact that peace should not be promoted at the expense of democracy, they presented slightly different views on the topic of the International Criminal Court (ICC). Brown thought it was deplorable that it is possible to be credibly accused of crimes against humanity and still be elected president. He regretted that Kenyatta had not been held accountable earlier for the post-election violence of 2007/08, which could have prevented this situation. Aukot, in turn, maintained that the elections in Kenya demonstrated that the international community cannot tell a people whom to vote for. He went on to stress that international criminal justice should not work at the expense of democracy. He emphasised the need to construct democratic processes to accompany procedures of international criminal justice. Furthermore, he wondered whether the ICC is looking only one way, not holding Western leaders accountable. If the ICC exclusively prosecutes cases in Africa, it will lose its legitimacy and the confidence of Africans. Agreeing with Aukot on this point, Lynch emphasised the need for a constructive debate on the purpose of the ICC.

Finally, chairwoman Angelika Spelten asked the three panelists whether they had any recommendations for Kenya. Lynch was hesitant to give any concrete recommendations, as she considered it problematic to give advice from the outside. She equally stressed that it is important to have multiple priorities and not to solely focus on one topic, such as peace. Aukot thought it was important to implement the spirit of the constitution and to evaluate the costs of the constitution and the new political system it builds. Many Kenyans have very high expectations but are not really aware of the costs a political reform entails. Brown emphasised that donors should listen to what Kenyans have to say and suggested working together with local civil society.

After the lively dialogue between the three experts the discussion was opened to the floor. The main issues that have been argued out during this session were the following questions:

- Which role do donors play in Kenya?
- How do Kenya’s institutions perform?
- What is Kenya’s significance for the ICC?

After the Q&A session Julia Leininger, Researcher in the department ‘Governance, Statehood, Security’ at the DIE, wrapped up the Dialogue by resuming the central points of the dynamic discussion which allowed for both personal insights from the Kenya experts and critical analyses of the current political situation. Especially stressed was the fact that not only does the ICC have importance for Kenya but that Kenya is also a very important case for the ICC. If the Kenyan case ends without verdicts, the ICC will be decisive damaged.
**Events**

**Käte Hamburger Lectures**

The Käte Hamburger Lectures are a series of public lectures delivered by internationally renowned academics and practitioners – some of them Senior Fellows at the Centre – working in areas that fall within the Centre’s key spheres of interest. Through these lectures, the Centre seeks to make the academic community and the wider public aware of its areas of interest, inform them of its findings, and promote discussion amongst them. The lectures provide interested audiences with a unique opportunity to discuss the Centre’s key research areas in depth with outstanding experts.

4th Käte Hamburger Lecture:
Jan Aart Scholte
World Financial Crisis and Civil Society: Implications for Global Democracy
5 June 2013
Duisburg, Grand City Hotel Duisburger Hof

5th Käte Hamburger Lecture:
Ramesh Thakur
Global Governance and the State of Nuclear Weapons
12 June 2013
Berlin, Haus der EKD
Organized in cooperation with the Development and Peace Foundation (SEF)

6th Käte Hamburger Lecture:
Robert Jessop
Rethinking State Power and Governance in a ‘World’ of Complexity
27 June 2013
Duisburg, H2Office

7th Käte Hamburger Lecture:
Jürgen Fischer
Tolerance and Cooperation in the Affen-gesellschaft
12 November 2013
Duisburg, H2Office

**Käte Hamburger Dialogues**

The Käte Hamburger Dialogues are a key element in getting the general public and academic community involved in the work of the Centre. Moderated discussion between fellows and other experts allows for in-depth analysis, concise appraisal, and lively debate on themes from the Centre’s research and on current political events and issues.

1st Käte Hamburger Dialogue:
Ekuru Aukot, Gabrielle Lynch, and Stephen Brown
Elections, Violence and International Criminal Justice: The Case of Kenya
13 April 2013
Bonn, DIE
Organized in cooperation with the DIE

**Masterclass Retreats**

Masterclass Retreats offer prominent experts an opportunity to engage in extensive discussion of selected wide-ranging topics that link into the key research areas of all four research units. This distinctive ‘workshop’ atmosphere lends new momentum to the Centre’s work and is a source of innovative input for Centre publications.

Towards a Better Understanding of Complexity and Scale and Their Relevance for Global Cooperation
30–31 August 2013
Duisburg, Landschaftspark Duisburg-Nord
Embedded in the Ruhrtriennale arts festival

**Practitioner Seminars**

The Centre’s interactive Practitioner Seminars aim to link up the Centre’s theoretical findings with the empirical data garnered by practitioners in the field. Each year from 2013 to 2016, there will be an intensive one-day workshop on the theme ‘A Post-Kyoto Global Climate Regime’. We hope that this Delphi-style series of meetings, located at the interface between theory and practice, will result in the formation of a permanent work-group comprising ten or so experts from the field plus the directors of the Centre. The annual ‘exchange platforms’ will take place alternately in Berlin and Brussels.

Climate Policy after Doha – What Next?
26 April 2013
Berlin, Office of the North Rhine-Westphalia Representative to the Federal Government

**Workshops**

The Centre’s international workshops provide platforms at which guest speakers, panelists, and interested academics and practitioners can engage in intensive discussion of particular research topics. The workshops offer participants vital opportunities to strengthen networks within their areas of research.

Successful Cooperation (2)
13–14 May 2013
Duisburg, H2Office

Democratic Interventionism and Local Legitimacy
22–23 May 2013
Duisburg, H2Office
Organized in cooperation with the School of Political Science and International Studies, University of Queensland

Rethinking Governance in a World of Complexity
27–28 June 2013
Duisburg, H2Office

“The Invisible Hands” – Successful Cooperation (3)
29 August 2013
Duisburg, Landschaftspark Duisburg-Nord
A symposium held as part of the Ruhrtriennale arts festival

Transcultural Constructions of Global Legitimacy
13–15 November 2013
Duisburg, H2Office

Successful Cooperation (4)
9–10 December 2013
Essen, KWI

*Unless otherwise specified, all events are organized by the Käte Hamburger Kolleg/Centre for Global Cooperation Research.*
The Research Colloquium is the intellectual meeting point where fellows and colleagues of the Centre present and discuss current research projects, papers, and findings in a productive, interdisciplinary environment. The topic for each session falls under one of three key rubrics of the Centre’s research programme:

- Cooperation/Culture/Gift exchange (coop)
- Legitimacy/Democracy/Justice (legi)
- Global Governance/Case studies/Other perspectives (glob)

Transcultural Constructions of Global Legitimacy (legi/glob)
8 January 2013
Jan Aart Scholte

The Basis of India’s Foreign and Security Policy – A Messy but Resilient Melting-pot (glob)
25 January 2013
Herbert Walff

5 February 2013
Peter Thiery

Chinese Perspectives on Global Governance (glob)
19 February 2013
Hung-Jen Wang

The Future of Social Interaction: Globalization, Artificial Intelligence, and Dementia Society (coop)
26 February 2013
Christian Meyer

Modern Communications Technologies and the Extension of the Territory of Struggle: Conceptualizing Tunisia’s Jasmine Revolution (glob)
12 March 2013
Mathieu Rousselin

The Rule of the Project: Practices of Justification in Times of Global Economic Crisis (legi)
19 March 2013
Frank Gadinger and Taylan Yildiz

Responsiveness or Influence? Whom to Lobby in International Climate Change Negotiations (glob)
7 May 2013
Carola Betzold (ETH Zürich)

What Then is ‘Global’ About Global Governance? (glob)
21 May 2013
Esref Aksu

Aspiration Balancing – Bridging the Gap Between Normative and Descriptive Bargaining Theory (coop)
4 June 2013
Marlies Ahlert (co-authored with Ildiko Lajtos)

South–South Cooperation, North–South Aid and the Prospect of an International Aid Architecture (glob)
11 June 2013
Meibo Huang

The Aid Orphan Myth (glob)
18 June 2013
Stephen Brown (co-authored with Liam Swiss)

Colonialism and the Responsibility to Protect (legi)
9 July 2013
Siddharth Mallavarapu

Cultures of Self-deprecation: Stress, Inclusion, Cooperation, and Wellbeing (coop)
6 August 2013
Matthew Johnson (University of Lancaster)

Punishment, Reward, and Their Impact on Cooperation: An Evolutionary Perspective (coop)
27 August 2013
Jennifer Jacquet (New York University)
The Käte Meets DIE Colloquium provides a forum for exchange and debate for fellows and colleagues from the Käte Hamburger Kolleg / Centre for Global Cooperation Research and the German Development Institute / Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE). Presentation of a topic by a Centre fellow is followed by a response from a DIE researcher before the meeting is opened up for general discussion.

Further Events

The Centre is very keen to forge links with other institutions and stakeholders in relevant areas of expertise. One important way in which it extends its reach and strengthens its affiliations is by co-organizing and participating in events within Germany and internationally.

Guidances to Coordination: Team Reasoning or Simply Rule Following? (coop)
10 September 2013
Bernd Lahno

Multilateral Aid – Do Trust Funds Offer New Perspectives? (coop)
1 October 2013
Margret Thalwitz

Memory, Human Rights, and Democratization in Africa (legi)
8 October 2013
Abou Jeng

Is China’s Economic Ascendancy a Fundamental Challenge to American Power? (coop/glob)
15 October 2013
Dong Wang

The ‘Globality’ of Democratic Self-governance: Some Trends and Speculations on Complexity, Empowerment, and Agency (legi)
29 October 2013
Jessica Schmidt

Histories of Corruption – Political Malpractice as a Global Discourse (coop)
5 November 2013
Steven Pierce

The Path to Post-colonial Cultural Development: Restitution or Cooperation? Zaire, Belgium, and the Struggle over Cultural Heritage (coop)
19 November 2013
Sarah Van Beurden

Culture, ‘Relationality’, and Global Cooperation (coop/glob)
26 November 2013
Morgan Brigg

Global Cooperation as an Approach to Civilizing Conflict – Conceptual Considerations and Empirical Evidence (glob/coop)
10 December 2013
Lothar Brock

Trust in Financial Markets
20 March 2013
Bernd Lahno

Diversity, Complexity, Uncertainty: What Does This Mean for Our Research?
17 June 2013
Morgan Brigg

Is There a Link Between Globalization and the Individual Propensity to Cooperate? Results from Cross-cultural Experiments and Their Relevance for Global Cooperation Research
16 September 2013
Gianluca Grimalda

The United States and China: A History from the Eighteenth Century to the Present
3 June 2013
Duisburg, H2Office
Book presentation by Dong Wang

Democratizing World Society: Post-national Perspectives and Opposing Views
18–21 September 2013
Warsaw, Poland
Section of the 8th Pan-European Conference on International Relations: One International Relations or Many? Multiple Worlds, Multiple Crises
Section convenors Rainer Baumann, Tobias Debiel, and Frank Gadinger

Human Security Reconsidered: Is there a Shift to the Local? and Human Security and Humanitarian Practices
24–27 October 2013
Istanbul, Turkey
Panel convenors Tobias Debiel, David Chandler, and Lothar Brock

China’s Perspective on the Development of Sub-Saharan Countries
27 November 2013
Duisburg, H2Office
Lecture and discussion with Song Wei Organized jointly with the Confucius Institute Metropolis Ruhr, University of Duisburg-Essen

Between Destabilization and Pluralization: Peace in Times of Global Power Shifts
6–8 December 2013
Arnoldshain, Germany
Annual meeting of the Federation of German Scientists Organized by the Federation of German Scientists in cooperation with the Centre for Global Cooperation Research and the Protestant Academy Frankfurt am Main

Development Challenges in a Changing Context of Global Cooperation
4 November 2013
Duisburg, University of Duisburg-Essen UAMR (University Alliance Metropolis Ruhr) Development Day
Organized by the UAMR Graduate Centre For Development Studies, with contributions from a variety of institutions including the Centre for Global Cooperation Research
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Publications of the Centre

Global Dialogues

The ‘Global Dialogues’ series reflects the kind of intellectual and interdisciplinary exchange that lies at the core of the Centre’s activities. Targeted at a broad-ranging specialist readership, it spotlights particular topics from a variety of standpoints.

ISSN 2198-1957 (Print)
ISSN 2198-0403 (Online)

- The ‘Global Dialogues’ series reflects the kind of intellectual and interdisciplinary exchange that lies at the core of the Centre’s activities. Targeted at a broad-ranging specialist readership, it spotlights particular topics from a variety of standpoints.

ISSN 2198-042X (Online)
ISSN 2198-1965 (Print)

Global Cooperation Research Papers

The ‘Research Papers’ series is intended to reflect the latest state of research at the Centre. Individual papers are based on ideas that have emerged from in-depth exploration at one of the Centre’s Research Colloquiums. Papers may be submitted either by fellows and permanent staff members or by visiting academics and their research partners.

ISSN 2198-1949 (Print)
ISSN 2198-0411 (Online)


Annual Reports

The Annual Report offers an overview of ongoing research and other activities at the Centre. As well as a thematic look-back over the year, and reports from the various areas of research (the ‘Factory Report’), it includes news of events held during the reporting period (‘Cherries’), profiles of the fellows, a complete list of publications, and the yearly ‘Global Cooperation Outlook’.

ISSN 2198-1965 (Print)
ISSN 2198-042X (Online)


Other Publications


Chandler, David (2014). ‘Democracy Unbound’ Non-Linear Politics and the Politicisation of Everyday Life’, European Journal of Social Theory 17 (1). (Published online first, 20 June 2013)


Messner, Dirk et al. (eds.) (2013). Globalisierungsgestaltung und internationale Übereinkommen, Wiesbaden: Springer VS.


In its second year, the Centre attracted 31 fellows from five continents doing research at institutions based in 11 countries. Fellows’ research projects fall within the ambit of one or other of the Centre’s four research units, but their work is conducted independently within the Centre. Fellows are the ‘building-blocks’ of the Centre’s research programme, contributing to events, publications, and ongoing interdisciplinary discussions. With its four levels of fellowship, the Centre offers a place for reflection and exchange open to individuals from every region of the world – renowned scholars and promising young academics from the humanities and social and natural sciences, as well as selected practitioners from the field.

**Fellows**

**Research Unit 1**  
“The (Im)Possibility of Cooperation”

- **Senior Fellow, April 2013–March 2014**  
  Project: Cooperation in Negotiations – Theory, Experiments, Case Studies
  - Research areas: Social choice theory; experimental economics; health economics; cooperation in negotiations
  - 1996–: Professor of Economics, with a special interest in microeconomics and public economics, Martin Luther University
  - 1994–1996: Acting Professor of Economics, University of Siegen, Germany
  - 1994: Habilitation (lectureship qualification), University of Osnabrück, Germany
  - 1986–1994: Assistant, Department of Economics, University of Osnabrück
  - 1977–1979: Assistant, Department of Mathematics, University of Bielefeld, Germany
  - Various positions in committees in the German health-sector
  - Conduct of various medical and financial projects funded by the German Research Foundation (DFG) (ongoing)

- **Fellow, August 2013–January 2014**  
  Project: Experimental Analysis of the Behavioural Foundations of Global Cooperation
  - Research areas: Experimental economics; behavioural bases of cooperation; globalization; individual sense of distributive justice, fairness, merit, and deservedness; cultural comparative analysis
  - 2009–: Lecturer, Department of Economics, Jaume I University
  - 2006: Co-ordinator of the research programme ‘Globalisation and Regional Integration: Their Impacts on Employment and Inequality in EU Neighbouring Countries’, part of a research project on ‘Inequality: Mechanisms, Effects, and Policies’ funded by the European Commission
  - 2005: Co-principal investigator on the project ‘Globalization, Trust, and Cooperation: An Experimental Analysis’, funded by the National Science Foundation (USA)
  - 2003: Ph.D. in economics from the University of Southampton: ‘Individual Choice, Social Norms and Growth’
  - 2002–2007: Research Fellow and Teaching Fellow, Centre for the Study of Globalisation and Regionalisation, University of Warwick, UK
  - July 1996: Roberto Franceschi Award for the best final-year dissertation in development economics, Bocconi University, Italy

- **Senior Fellow, June–August 2013**  
  Project: Cognitive Studies and Institutional Designs for Cooperation
  - Research areas: Politics of knowledge; cognition, politics and well-being; global governance and systemic power transition theories; International Relations theory; institutions; intellectual histories of the global South
  - 2012–: Associate Professor and Chairperson, Department of International Relations, South Asian University
  - 2005–: Assistant Professor, Centre for International Politics, Organisation and Disarmament, School of International Studies, Jawaharlal Nehru University, India
  - Researcher on the project ‘The Post-Transatlantic Age: A Twenty First Century Concert of Powers’, conducted by the Peace Research Institute Frankfurt and funded by the Compagnia di San Paolo (Italy), the Volkswagenstiftung (Germany), and the Riksbankens Jubileumsfond (Sweden)

- **Fellow, April 2013–March 2014**  
  Project: Cooperation in Negotiations – Theory, Experiments, Case Studies
  - Research areas: Social choice theory; experimental economics; health economics; cooperation in negotiations

**Dr Dr Marlies Ahlert**  
Martin Luther University, Halle-Wittenberg, Germany

**Dr Gianluca Grimalda**  
Jaume I University, Castellón, Spain

**Dr Siddharth Mallavarapu**  
South Asian University, India
Margret Thalwitz

- Senior Expert Fellow, June – August 2013
- Project: The Golden Rice Project and the Global Governance of Food
- Research areas: Public goods; global governance; food security
- Has been a consultant to the World Bank, UNICEF, and the German Ministry of Economic Cooperation
- Research Associate with the University of Oxford’s Global Economic Governance Programme and with the German Development Institute/Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungs Politik (DIE), Bonn
- Masters in Economics from the University of Freiburg/Breisgau, Germany
- Alumna of the German Development Institute’s postgraduate programme

Prof. Dong Wang (Ph.D.)
University of Turku, Finland

- Senior Fellow, March 2013 – February 2014
- Project: Chinese Conceptions of Effective and Just Global Governance (with special reference to intellectual property rights)
- Research areas: US–China relations; Chinese foreign relations; modern and contemporary Chinese history; the interaction of China with the outside world
- Professor of Contemporary Chinese History and Director of the Centre for East Asian Studies, University of Turku
- Research Associate, Fairbank Center for Chinese Studies, Harvard University
- 2002 – 2009: Professor of Chinese History and Executive Director of the East-West Institute of International Studies, Gordon College, USA
- Publications on contemporary Chinese history and foreign relations, with particular emphasis on interaction between China and the outside world as exhibited in the fields of: international organizations, nationalism, international law, charities, the environment, urban development, heritage, religion, art, the economy, and US–China relations

Prof. Dr Bernd Lahno
Frankfurt School of Finance & Management, Germany

- Senior Fellow, February 2013 – January 2014
- Project: Norms and Rules as a Foundation of Social Cooperation; including the sub-projects: (1) Strategic Problems in Information Transmission, (2) Team Reasoning as a Form of Rule-Following Behaviour, and (3) Can a Social Contract be Shaped by an Invisible Hand?
- Research areas: Trust and cooperation; choice theory; philosophy of economics; collective intentionality and team reasoning; rational-choice analysis of communication; rule-following behaviour; conceptual foundations of contract theory
- 2006 –: Professor of Philosophy and Quantitative Methods, Department of Legal Studies and Ethics, Frankfurt School of Finance & Management
- 2001 – 2006: Research and Teaching Assistant, Department of Philosophy, University of Duisburg-Essen
- Founding/chief editor of Rationality, Markets and Morals (RMM), an interdisciplinary open-access journal at the intersection of philosophy and economics

Prof. Dr Lothar Brock
Peace Research Institute Frankfurt (PRIF), Germany

- Senior Expert Fellow, February 2013 – January 2014
- Project: Cooperation in Conflict. Civilizing Difference?
- Research areas: International cooperation: institutional and normative aspects; legalization and the use of force at the international level; protecting people in conflict; democratic wars; dynamics of securitization; North-South relations
- 2006 –: Visiting Professor, PRIF
- 1981 – 2005: Head of Research Groups, intermittent member of the Executive Council, PRIF
- 2004 –: Lecturer (Professor Emeritus), Goethe University Frankfurt, Germany
- 1979 – 2004: Professor of Political Science, Goethe University Frankfurt, main focus on international relations
- 2003 – 2013: Member of the International Review Panel, National Centre of Competence in Research North-South, Bern
- 2013 –: Head of the Academic Advisory Council, Development and Peace Foundation (SEF), Bonn
- Consultancy work for various academic journals and for institutions such as the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ), and the Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung (FES)
Research Unit 2
“Global Cultural Conflicts and Transcultural Cooperation”

Prof. Dr. Frank Adloff
University of Erlangen-Nuremberg, Germany

Dr. Sarah Van Beurden
Ohio State University, United States of America

Jaroslava Gajdošová, Ph.D.
University of New York in Prague, Czech Republic

• Senior Fellow, October 2013 – March 2014
• Project: Gifts of Cooperation: The Relevance of Marcel Mauss
• Research areas: Social theory and cultural sociology; gift giving, philanthropy, and civil society; sociology of emotions; pragmatism and interactionism
• 2010 –: Professor of Sociology, University of Erlangen-Nuremberg
• 2007 – 2010: Professor of Sociology, John F. Kennedy Institute for North American Studies, Freie Universität Berlin
• 2006 – 2007: Max Weber Fellow, European University Institute, Florence, Italy
• 2004: Theodor Heuss Lecturer, New School for Social Research, New York
• 2002 – 2007: Assistant Professor, Institute of Sociology, University of Göttingen, Germany

• Fellow, July – December 2013
• Project: Postcolonial Cultures of Cooperation: Belgium, Congo, and the Rise of an International Regime
• Research areas: Modern African history; colonial and postcolonial studies; transnational history; museum and material culture studies
• 2009 –: Ohio State University: Assistant Professor, Department of African American and African Studies; affiliate, Department of History and Arts History
• Spring 2010: Postdoctoral Fellow, Institute for Historical Studies, University of Texas at Austin, USA
• Summer 2009: Ph.D. in history, University of Pennsylvania, USA
• 2006: Visiting Scholar, Institut des Musées Nationaux, Kinshasa-Lubumbashi, Democratic Republic of the Congo
• Recipient of various grants and awards, including an Annenberg Fellowship at the University of Pennsylvania and a Rockefeller Archive research grant
• Vice-president, Congolese Studies Association
• Founding member of ATTITUDE (Association Congolaise pour le Développement Artistique et Culturel), a Kinshasa-based organization for the promotion of young Congolese artists

• Fellow, September 2013 – August 2014
• Project: Transitional Justice and Collective Memory between Impunity and Oblivion: Cultural Translation of Global Justice in Czech and East German Post-communist Transition
• Research areas: Post-totalitarian societies and democracy; collective identity and memory; social condition, habitus, gender; critical theory and phenomenology
• 2011 –: Lecturer, Department of Sociology, University of New York in Prague
• 2010 –: Assistant Professor, School of Humanities and Social Sciences, Anglo-American University, Prague
• Alfred Schutz Memorial Award in Philosophy and Sociology, New School for Social Research, New York
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Dr Steven Pierce
University of Manchester, United Kingdom

Dr Mario Schmidt
Formerly of Goethe University, Frankfurt am Main, Germany

Dr Abdolkarim Soroush
Iranian philosopher

Senior Fellow, July–December 2013
Project: Government and the Body in Pain: Humanitarianism, Vulnerability, and the Culpabilities of Power

Research areas: Africa, and specifically northern Nigeria; historical anthropology; law; politics; gender and sexuality

2006—: Lecturer in Modern African History, University of Manchester

2010–2011: Member of the School of Social Science, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, New Jersey, USA

2000–2005: Assistant Professor of History, Tulane University, USA

2000: Ph.D. in anthropology and history, University of Michigan, USA

Various publications on northern Nigeria, esp. on the issues of corruption and colonialism

Postdoc Fellow, September 2013–August 2014
Project: ‘Democracy Died today’ – Food, Money and Votes During the Kenyan General Election 2013

Research areas: Economic anthropology (esp. theories of exchange and money); French anthropology (esp. Marcel Mauss, Collège de Sociologie, Levi-Strauss); linguistic anthropology; anthropology of food; East African cultures (esp. coastal Algonquian cultures); Native American Cultures

2010–2013: Research fellow and scholarship holder on the postgraduate programme ‘Value and Equivalence’, Goethe University; dissertation title: ‘Circulating Fetishes and Interlaced Monetization: About Wampum and Beaver Pelts as Maussian ‘objets sociaux totaux’ in the Colonial Economy of Northeast North America during the 17th Century’


Senior Fellow, September 2012–March 2013
Project: Debating Islam

Research areas: Philosophy of science; philosophy of religion; the philosophical system of Moulana Rumi; comparative philosophy

2000—: Visiting Professor, Harvard University, teaching ‘Islam and Democracy’, Quranic studies, and the philosophy of Islamic law

2013–2014: Visiting Professor in the Academy for World Religions, University of Hamburg, teaching religious pluralism and Islamic philosophy

Visiting Professorship Stanford University (2012), Chicago University (2011), and Leiden/Amsterdam University (2007), teaching Islamic reform and philosophy

Visiting scholar, universities of Yale, Princeton, and the Institute for Advanced Study, Berlin

Studied chemistry, history and philosophy in London

Studied Islamic philosophy and mysticism in Iran

Publications include: Reason, Freedom, and Democracy in Islam: Essential Writings of Abdolkarim Soroush, tr. and ed. Mahmoud and Ahmad Sadri, Oxford University Press, 2000

Fellow, October 2013–September 2014
Project: The Global Regime of Transitional Justice

Research areas: Political cultures (esp. 20th century); cultures and politics of remembrance (esp. 20th century); transitional justice; cultural and societal dimensions of European integration

2012–2013: Visiting Professor, Department of Cultural Sociology, University of Konstanz

2009–2012: Director, ‘History + Memory’ research group, University of Konstanz

2010: Senior Teaching Fellow, International Graduate Centre for the Study of Culture, Justus Liebig University Giessen, Germany

2008: Visiting Fellow, University College London

2000–2008: Assistant Professor, Faculty of Cultural Studies, European University Viadrina Frankfurt (Oder), Germany

Reviewer for, amongst others: Studienstiftung des deutschen Volkes, Volkswagen Foundation, and Austrian Science Fund

Co-editor of the Memory Cultures series (publ. Transcript) and the Jahrbuch für Politik und Geschichte (Politics and History Yearbook, publ. Franz Steiner)
Senior Fellow, October 2013 – April 2014
Project: Global Governance in Flux: Justice Institutions, International Responsibility, and Cultural Diversity
Research areas: International law and organizations; international political economy and integration; conflict management and resolution; political violence and terrorism; migration; political and social movements; religion and politics; women in politics and law

2002 –: Director, Institute for Transborder Studies, Kwantlen Polytechnic University
1998: LL.B., University of British Columbia, Canada
1991 –: Professor of Politics and International Law, Kwantlen Polytechnic University
Ph.D. in political science, Graduate Institute of International Studies, Geneva
Practising lawyer in Canadian and International Law
Active member of the Canadian Bar Association (CBA)
Consultancy work for, amongst others, the Solicitor General of Canada and the government of Israel; currently on the intervener team acting for the CBA in the case of Kazemi et al. v. Islamic Republic of Iran et al. S.C.C., 2013 – 2014
Manuscript referee for, amongst others: Leiden Journal of International Law; Canadian Journal of Political Science; and St Antony’s International Review (Oxford)

Senior Fellow, March – November 2013
Project: Relational Difference and Universalism: Utilizing Culture as a Resource for Conflict Resolution and Global Cooperation
Research areas: Conflict resolution; culture and the politics of difference; indigenous political philosophies and systems; peace-building and governance across difference; development studies; alternative and innovative methodologies
2012 –: Senior Lecturer in Peace and Conflict Studies, School of Political Science and International Studies, University of Queensland
Extensive professional experience as a mediator and facilitator, including experience in conflict-resolution training in Aboriginal Australia, the Solomon Islands, and Indonesia

Senior Fellow, October 2012 – July 2013
Project: The Future of Social Interaction
Research areas: Anthropological bases, cultural shaping, and boundaries of cooperative social practices; changes in the forms and modalities of social interaction caused by globalization, artificial intelligence and dementia; local appropriations and vernacularizations of global discourses about ‘the good life’ in Senegal and beyond
On-going: Various projects funded by the German Research Foundation (DFG) at the University of Bielefeld, e.g. ‘Microdynamics of Political Communication in World Society: The Social Life of Democracy in Two Islamic States’, in collaboration with J. Pfaff-Czarnecka, E. Gerharz and S. Diop
2012 – 2016: Member of the Scientific Network on ‘Multimodality and Embodied Interaction’, Universities of Potsdam and Saarland (funded by DFG)
2012: Visiting Professor, Department of Sociology, University of Halle-Wittenberg, Germany
2007 – 2012: Various teaching positions, Faculty of Sociology, University of Bielefeld
2004 – 2007: Research Fellow and Co-director of the project ‘Persuasive Communication among the Wolof: The Interplay of Cultural and Linguistic Aspects’, Department of Anthropology and African Studies, University of Mainz, Germany, in collaboration with Anna M. Diagne (funded by the Volkswagen Foundation)

Research Unit 3
“Global Governance Revisited”

PD Dr Christian Meyer
University of Bielefeld, Germany

Dr Morgan Brigg
University of Queensland, Australia

Prof. Noemi Gal-Or, Ph.D., LL.B.
Kwantlen Polytechnic University, Canada
Senior Expert Fellow, October 2012 – September 2013
- Project: India's Role in Global Affairs
  - Research areas: Indian foreign and security policy; the defence industry (arms exports); peace-keeping and peace-building; global governance; arms control and disarmament; privatization in the armed forces; developing countries and aid
- 2001 –: Senior Fellow (formerly Director), BICC
- Adjunct Senior Researcher (formerly Deputy Director), INEF, University of Duisburg-Essen
- 2007, 2010: Visiting scholar, Australian Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies, University of Queensland
- Research as Project Leader at the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute and at the Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy, University of Hamburg, Germany
- 2006: Peter Becker Prize for Peace and Conflict Studies, Philipps University of Marburg, Germany
- 2002: Professorship awarded by the government of North Rhine-Westphalia, Germany
- Consultant for various international organizations and institutes, e.g.: KfW development bank, GIZ, UNDP, International Peace Institute New York, and the European Commission

Senior Fellow, November 2012 – March 2013
- Project: Explorations in Global Democracy
- Research areas: World-historical-sociological perspectives on social change; globalization; governing a more global world; civil society and global politics; building global democracy; methodologies of global research
- 2013 –: Faculty Chair in Peace and Development, School of Global Studies, University of Gothenburg
- 2011 –: Professor, Department of Politics and International Studies, University of Warwick
- 2008 –: Convenor, international ‘Building Global Democracy’ programme
- 2005 – 2009: Lead editor of the journal Global Governance; member of editorial boards of 11 other journals
- Publications on problems of global governance and international organizations

Fellow, January–June 2013
- Project: Global Governance Reconsidered: A Conceptual Approach
- Research areas: Global governance; intellectual and conceptual history of international relations; cosmopolitanism
- 2012 –: Non-resident Research Associate, Dipartimento di Studi Anglo-Germanici e dell’Europa Orientale, University of Bari, Italy
- 2004–2012: Lecturer in International Relations, Political Science and International Relations Programme, Victoria University of Wellington
- Further teaching and research positions at: Bilkent University, Turkey; University of Limerick, Ireland; La Trobe University, Melbourne, Australia
- Publications on problems of global governance and international organizations

Associate Postdoc Fellow, January–December 2013
- Projects: (1) Legitimacy in Global Environmental Governance; (2) Territories and Resistance: Tunisia as Democratization Laboratory
- Research areas: European integration; the European Neighbourhood Policy and Euro-Mediterranean relations; Europeanization and European external governance; rule transfer and diffusion approaches; social movement theory; territories and territorialisation; Franco-German cooperation
- Associate Postdoc Fellowship with a grant by the Swiss National Science Foundation
- 2008–2012: Researcher, Centre for Governance and Culture in Europe, and Academic Assistant to the Chair of European Politics, both at the University of St. Gallen
- 2009–2011: Co-founder and academic co-ordinator, Chios Institute for Mediterranean Affairs, Greece
- 2007 – 2008: Tutor and Research Assistant, College of Europe, Brussels
- 2007: Master in European Advanced Interdisciplinary Studies, College of Europe, Poland
Research Unit 4
“Paradoxes and Perspectives of Democratization”

- Senior Fellow, January–June 2013
- Project: Global Cooperation and Development Policy Coherence
- Research areas: Foreign aid; democratization; African politics; political violence; peace-building and transitional justice
- 2013–: Professor, School of Political Studies, University of Ottawa
- 2006–2013: Associate Professor, School of Political Studies, University of Ottawa
- 2010: Professor, Centre de recherche et d’étude sur les pays d’Afrique orientale, Université de Pau et des Pays de l’Adour, Pau, France
- 2009: Visiting Researcher, DIE, Bonn
- 2000: Ph.D., Department of Politics, New York University
- Consultancy work for, amongst others, the Development Assistance Committee of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and the Pearson Peacekeeping Centre

- Senior Fellow, March–September 2013
- Project: China’s Foreign Aid and Its Role in the International Aid Architecture
- Research areas: International monetary cooperation; East Asian monetary cooperation; macro-economic policy coordination; regional economic integration; the international development assistance system; the Chinese foreign aid system
- Professor of Economics, Xiamen University, and Director of China Institute for International Development
- Deputy Secretary General, China Society of World Economics
- 2010 – 2011: Global South Scholar in Residence, Faculty of International Economics, The Graduate Institute for International and Development Studies, Geneva, Switzerland
- 2006–2007: Research associate, Global Economic Governance Programme, University of Oxford
- Member of United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) expert group ‘Promoting Responsible Sovereign Lenders and Borrowers’
- Consultancy work for the Chinese government in the areas of international development assistance and cross-strait economic integration

- Postdoc Fellow, June 2013 – May 2014
- Project: Memory, Human Rights, and Democratization in Africa
- Research areas: Human rights; governance and constitutionalism; globalization; international law; democracy; memory; transitional justice
- 2011–2012: Associate Research Fellow, Centre for Human Rights in Practice, University of Warwick
- 2010: Ph.D. in international law, University of Warwick
- 2007–2011: Tutor and Lecturer, School of Law, University of Warwick
- 2003–2005: Senior Legal Officer and Board Secretary, National Water and Electricity Department, The Gambia
- Awarded the Calcutt Subject Prize for Outstanding Performance in Individual Subjects, University of Wales, UK
- Number of consultancy projects including an evaluation of governance, rule of law, and constitutionalism in The Gambia and impact assessments for human rights and humanitarian law projects
- Publications on international law, peacebuilding, and the African Union
Dr Kai Koddenbrock  
Formerly of the University of Bremen, Germany

- Postdoc Fellow, September 2013 – August 2014
- Project: A Democratic Ethos of Intervention? Attitudes Towards Political Struggle in Western Humanitarianism and Peacebuilding
- Research areas: Intervention; social theory; anthropology of the state; international political economy; financial markets
- April–June 2013: Senior researcher, Global Public Policy Institute, Berlin, working on a study on the imbalances of humanitarian action for the German Ministry of Foreign Affairs
- 2011–2014: Teaching positions at the universities of Magdeburg and Duisburg-Essen, Germany
- 2011: Visiting Scholar, Department of Middle Eastern, South Asian and African Studies, Columbia University, New York
- 2008–2009: Research Associate, Global Public Policy Institute, Berlin
- 2004–2009: Consultancy assignments for e.g.: Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit, Eschborn; Germany; UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, New York
- Reviewer for the Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding; Ethical Perspectives; and Resilience

Dr Jessica Schmidt  
Formerly of the University of Westminster, United Kingdom

- Postdoc Fellow, August 2013 – July 2014
- Project: Crisis of Legitimacy and the Rise of Democracy as Social Form: The Growing Importance of Democratic Governance Support in the Global South
- Research areas: Changing discourses of democracy and the ‘illusion’ of autonomy; the shift from political to social understandings in international politics; agency, performativity, and the decline of the subject; complexity, resilience, and governance; pragmatism and new materialism
- 2011–2013: Visiting Lecturer, Department of Politics, and International Relations, University of Westminster, London
- 2009–2013: Ph.D., Department of Politics and International Relations, University of Westminster, London
- 2009–2013: MA in Political Science, University of Regensburg, Germany
- Book project: ‘From Artifice to Life: Democracy Promotion and the Rise of the Social’

Dr Isaline Bergamaschi  
Universidad de las Andes, Bogotá, Colombia

- Fellow, July 2012 – June 2013
- Project: Cosmopolitanism, Deliberation, and the State – Three Conundrums of Post-national Democracy
- Research areas: Democratic theory; democracy in the European Union; legitimacy of international institutions; global governance; Habermasian discourse theory
- July 2013 – Senior Researcher, EU’s Seventh Framework Research project ‘Barriers Towards European Citizenship (bEUcitizen)’, Goethe University Frankfurt
- 2007–2012: Senior Researcher on the ‘RECON – Reconstituting Democracy in Europe’ project, ARENA Centre for European Studies, University of Oslo
- 2001–2007: Research Associate, Technische Universität Darmstadt, Germany

Dr Daniel Gaus  
Goethe University Frankfurt am Main, Germany

- Fellow, July 2012 – June 2013
- Project: International Intervention in Mali: Transformation and Legitimacy
- Research areas: Political science; development studies; international studies; postcolonial studies; Latin American studies; international political economy; African studies; development anthropology
- 2012–2013: Assistant Professor, Department of Politics, Universidad de las Améndes
- 2013 – Assistant editor, Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding (publ.Taylor & Francis)
- 2011 –: Reviewer for various academic journals including: Journal of Development Studies, Politique africaine, Revue Tiers Monde
- 2009–2011: Temporary Lecturer and Researcher, Department of Political Science, University of Paris 1 Panthéon-Sorbonne
- 2009–2011: Guest lecturer, Institute of Political Studies of Paris
- 2009–2010: Adjunct Professor, Saint John’s University, Paris campus
- 2008 –: Research associate, Global Economic Governance Programme, University College, University of Oxford, UK
Dr Hung-Jen Wang
Formerly of the University of Tübingen, Germany

Dr Peter Thiery
University of Heidelberg, Germany

Prof. David Chandler (Ph.D.)
University of Westminster, United Kingdom

- Postdoc Fellow, September 2012 – January 2014
  - Projects: (1) China’s Rising Power and Global Governance, (2) Understanding Global Governance and Cooperation: A Comparative Study of the European Union, Great Britain, China, Japan and the United States

- Research areas: International relations theory; international security; global governance; democratization; comparative authoritarianism; Chinese foreign policy; cross-strait relations (China–Taiwan)

- 2012: Ph.D., European Research Center on Contemporary Taiwan (ERCCT), University of Tübingen
- 2006 – 2007: Sage Fellowship, Cornell University
- 2004 – 2006: Scholarship, Graduate School of International Studies, University of Denver, USA
- 2002: MA (with distinction), Queen’s University Belfast, UK

- Fellow, September 2012 – February 2013

- Research areas: Theory of/empirical research into democracy, the state, and the rule of law; formal and informal institutions; measuring democracy, the rule of law and governance; Latin America (Cono Sur, the Andes, Mexico)

- 2012 –: Lecturer, Institute of Political Science, University of Heidelberg
- 2008–2012: Senior Researcher and Project Manager, ‘The Rule of Law and Informal Institutions. Eastern Europe and Latin America in Comparative Perspective’, research project sponsored by the German Research Foundation (DFG) at the Institute of Political Science, University of Würzburg, Germany

- 2002 – 2010: Senior Researcher and Project Manager, ‘Defective Democracy’ research project sponsored by the Volkswagen Foundation at the Institute of Political Science, University of Heidelberg


- Senior Fellow, October 2012 – June 2013
  - Project: Democracy and the Shift to the Social

- Research areas: Democracy and distributive agency; the shift from spatial to temporal understandings of conflict; resilience, agency and subjectivity; new materialism, freedom and necessity; biopolitics and the shift to the social

- 2005 –: Professor of International Relations and Research Director of the Centre for the Study of Democracy, Department of Politics and International Relations, University of Westminster

- 2002 – 2003: Teaching positions at Brunel University and the University of Nottingham, UK

- Founding editor of the new journal Resilience: International Policies, Practices and Discourses and of the Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding

- Editor of the Routledge book series Studies in Intervention and Statebuilding and a new series Advances in Democratic Theory

- In addition to producing a number of monographs of his own, he has contributed well over 60 articles to peer-reviewed journals, as well as individual chapters to around 50 edited volumes
An international advisory board assists with the process of scientific quality assurance for the Centre. Consisting of ten internationally renowned academics and experts, the board convenes annually in Duisburg. The board advises on basic professional and interdisciplinary issues and supports the Centre’s research programme and strategic goals. The board’s annual meetings also provide an important opportunity for close interaction with the Centre’s staff and fellows.

**Advisory Board**

As of November 2013

- **Prof. Dr Dipesh Chakrabarty**
  - Professor of History and South Asian Languages and Civilizations, Law School, University of Chicago, USA

- **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

- **Dr Alixan Evans**
  - Independent Senior Advisor; former Director of the Overseas Development Institute (ODI), UK

- **Prof. Dr Harald Fischer-Tiné**
  - Full Professor of Modern Global History, ETH Zurich, Switzerland

- **Dr Daniel Haun**
  - Research Group Leader at the Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics and Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology, Nijmegen/Leipzig

- **Prof. Dr Pan Jiahua**
  - Professor of Economics and Director, Institute for Urban & Environmental Studies, Chinese Academy of Social Sciences (CASS), China

- **Prof. Dr Mirjam Künkler**
  - Assistant Professor of Near Eastern Studies, Princeton University, USA

- **Prof. Dr Thilo Marauhn**
  - Professor of Public Law, Public International Law and European Law, Justus Liebig University Giessen

- **Prof. Dr h.c. Angelika Nußberger**
  - Judge at the European Court of Human Rights, Straßburg; Director of the Institute of Eastern Europe Law, University of Cologne

- **Prof. Dr Michael Zürn**
  - Director of the Research Unit “Transnational Conflicts and International Institutions” at the Social Science Research Center Berlin (WZB)

**Staff**

As of November 2013

- **Wren Chadwick, B.A.**
  - Research Associate for Research Unit 4

- **Dr Daniel Haun**
  - Independent Senior Advisor; former Director of the Overseas Development Institute (ODI), UK

- **Prof. Dr Alison Evans**
  - Chair for International Relations and Theories of World Orders at the Cluster of Excellence “The Formation of Normative Orders”, Goethe University of Frankfurt

- **Prof. Dr Pan Jiahua**
  - Professor of Economics and Director, Institute for Urban & Environmental Studies, Chinese Academy of Social Sciences (CASS), China

- **Prof. Dr Thilo Marauhn**
  - Professor of Public Law, Public International Law and European Law, Justus Liebig University Giessen

- **Prof. Dr h.c. Angelika Nußberger**
  - Judge at the European Court of Human Rights, Straßburg; Director of the Institute of Eastern Europe Law, University of Cologne

- **Prof. Dr Michael Zürn**
  - Director of the Research Unit “Transnational Conflicts and International Institutions” at the Social Science Research Center Berlin (WZB)
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