

SEQÜÊNCIA

Publicação do
Programa de Pós-Graduação
em Direito da UFSC

VOLUME 46 ■ ANO 2025

Estudos
jurídicos
e políticos

SEQÜÊNCIA – ESTUDOS JURÍDICOS E POLÍTICOS é uma publicação temática e de periodicidade quadrimestral, editada pelo Programa de Pós-Graduação Stricto Sensu em Direito da Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina – UFSC.

SEQÜÊNCIA – ESTUDOS JURÍDICOS E POLÍTICOS is a thematic publication, printed every four months, edited by the Program in law of the Federal University of Santa Catarina – UFSC.

Versão eletrônica: <http://www.periodicos.ufsc.br/index.php/sequencia>

Editora-Chefe: Norma Sueli Padilha

Editor Associado: José Sérgio da Silva Cristóvam

Editores Adjuntos: Priscilla Camargo Santos, Thanderson Pereira de Sousa

A publicação é indexada nas seguintes bases de dados e diretórios/

The Publication is indexed in the following databases and directories:

Base OJS

Base PKP

CCN (Catálogo Coletivo Nacional)

Dialnet

DOAJ (Directory of Open Access Journals)

EBSCOhost

Genamics Journalseek

Google Scholar

ICAP (Indexação Compartilhada de Artigos de Periódicos)

Latindex

LivRe!

ÖAW

OJS

PKP

Portal de Periódicos UFSC

Portal do SEER

ProQuest

SciELO

Scopus/Elsevier

Sherpa/Romeo

Sumarios.org

ULRICH'S

vLex

Ficha catalográfica

Seqüência: Estudos jurídicos e políticos. Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina. Programa de Pós-Graduação em Direito. n.1 (janeiro 1980)-.

Florianópolis: Fundação José Boiteux. 1980-.

Publicação contínua

Resumo em português e inglês


Versão impressa ISSN 0101-9562

Versão on-line ISSN 2177-7055

1. Ciência jurídica. 2. Teoria política. 3. Filosofia do direito. 4. Periódicos. I. Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina. Programa de Pós-graduação em Direito

CDU 34(05)

Catálogo na fonte por: João Oscar do Espírito Santo CRB 14/849

PUBLICAÇÃO		SEQÜÊNCIA	Publicação do Programa de Pós-Graduação em Direito da UFSC	Estudos jurídicos e políticos
				Ano XLIX Volume 46

Assessing the Migration-Development nexus in forced migration through the lens of deglobalization and human rights

Avaliando a relação migração-desenvolvimento na migração forçada pela ótica da desglobalização e dos direitos humanos

Gabriela Soldano Garcez¹

Angela Limongi Alvarenga Alves¹

¹Universidade Católica de Santos, Santos, Brazil.

ABSTRACT: Thousands of people are forcibly displaced every year, sharing vulnerabilities, in terms of protection and rights, as well as exposure to risks, such as exploitation, smuggling, trafficking and discrimination. Thereby, the connection between forced migration and development is common given the impacts that migrants produce in the host cities, imposing the need for cooperation to establish better models of standards for migratory governance. However, with the deceleration of globalization, a new set of problems has been added to this global order. In this way, this article aims, through a critical-deductive analysis carried out through bibliographic reference, to unpack migration and the development nexus from the political perspective of deglobalization, using the Brazilian experiences, Mexico Action Plan and the Solidarity Cities initiative as examples, in order to answer the question about how the development-migration nexus can be affected from the process of deglobalization, through an analysis of international human law.

KEYWORDS: Deglobalization. Forced Migrations. Human rights. Development.

RESUMO: Milhares de pessoas são deslocadas à força todos os anos, compartilhando vulnerabilidades em termos de proteção e direitos, assim como exposição a riscos, tais como exploração, contrabando, tráfico e discriminação. Assim, a conexão entre migração forçada e desenvolvimento é recorrente, dados os impactos que os migrantes produzem nas cidades de acolhida, impondo a necessidade de cooperação para estabelecer melhores modelos e padrões de governança migratória. Contudo, com a desaceleração da globalização, um novo conjunto de problemas foi agregado a essa ordem global. Dessa forma, este artigo busca, por meio de uma análise crí-



co-dedutiva realizada com base em pesquisa bibliográfica, destrinchar o nexo entre migração e desenvolvimento a partir da perspectiva política da desglobalização, tomando como exemplos as experiências brasileiras, o Plano de Ação do México e a iniciativa Cidades Solidárias, a fim de responder à questão de como o nexo desenvolvimento-migração pode ser afetado pelo processo de desglobalização, por meio de uma análise do direito internacional dos direitos humanos.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Desglobalização. Migrações forçadas. Direitos humanos. Desenvolvimento.

1 INTRODUCTION

The causes of forced migration are diverse and are influenced by numerous other factors, such as immigration policies, human rights violations, persecution, violence, demographic and environmental changes, food insecurity, environmental disasters and/or climate change, labor, and employment needs, among others. As of the end of 2021, 89.3 million individuals worldwide were forcibly displaced as a result of persecution, conflict, violence, human rights violations or events seriously disturbing public order, according to UNHCR; other 53.2 million people were internally displaced due to armed conflict, generalized violence or human rights violations at the end of 2020, according to Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre, and an estimate between 50 and 200 million people will be environmentally displaced persons by 2050. Apart from the fact that they are all migrants, and that they share heightened vulnerabilities in terms of protection and rights, of exposure to different types of risks – such as violence, exploitation, smuggling and trafficking –, and of discrimination, a common trend in all of their situations is the connection between forced migration and development. Thereby, a nexus that has been dominating the debate and even determined an development-turn in migration governance in the Global Compacts of 2018, as well as made an appearance in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

From the root causes of forced migration to the impacts that migrants have in the host societies (such as in urban planning and

economical aspects – labor market (fostering entrepreneurship, supplying labor shortages), production, economic growth, budget balance, economic revitalization), and assistance to development and international cooperation are essential in establishing a better model of migration governance, the migration–development nexus is present. With most forced migrants living in the Global South this nexus is even more relevant, especially if it might impact the recognition, granting and respect to migrant’s human rights.

However, with the deceleration of globalization, a new set of problems has been added to the global liberal order, which is increasingly less receptive to migration. This movement points to what some theorists call “deglobalization” in order to indicate the current global deceleration of integration processes, both from the economic and political perspective.

In the economic sphere, the scenario is the worst since the “great depression” of 1929 as well as the realization of socioeconomic inequalities that affect the entire world; from the political perspective, international cooperation processes have never been so weakened – scenarios enhanced by the pandemic of COVID-19, which, in turn, has repercussions in several areas (Jubilut and Alves, 2021). Deglobalization, thus, translates the idea of an era marked by economic slowdown and difficulties in the operationalization of global governance mechanisms, which bring as a result very clearly identifiable concrete effects, both from the economic and the political point of view, which is why its approach is relevant to understanding the relationship between migration and development, especially in the current scenario and if one wants to face the depolitization of the debates in forced migration.

The sharp decline in investments, for instance, has serious repercussions for Africa, Asia and Latin America, worsening the scenario of compliance with the Sustainable Development Goals.

In this case, deglobalization represents a significant reduction of human rights. In relation to migration, deglobalization brings even greater impacts, leading to a worsening of the already vulnerable

situation, leading to increasingly restrictive policies. Consensus is lacking on whether deglobalization brings few or more reflexes for migration, but adding it as a lens through which the role of economics and politics can have in forced migration could be beneficial, especially in light of its aforementioned connection to human rights.

In this sense, adopting a protective approach, and using International Human Rights Law, International Refugee Law, theories of migration and theories on international governance, this paper aims to unpack the migration and development-nexus from the political perspective of deglobalization, in order to verify how the development-migration nexus can be affected by the phenomenon of deglobalization, through an analysis based on principles and guidelines of international human law.

In order to do so, it will tackle the development-migration nexus; present the concept of deglobalization and how it connects to human rights; and, finally, establish how the development-migration nexus can be assessed through the lenses of deglobalization and of human rights. The practical examples will focus on the Global South, not only due to the positionality of the authors as professors from Brazil (and, therefore, Latin America), but also due to the relevance that this context has for forced migration.

With that the paper aims to contribute to the advancement of the analysis of the development-migration nexus in general and forced migration in particular that are not depoliticized, with a view to assist in the betterment of the protection of forced migrants.

2 DEVELOPMENT TURN IN MIGRATION GOVERNMENTS

There are several global challenges of the globalization process, which has been defining the equation of socioeconomic and cultural relationships worldwide, being one of its most drastic points with regard to International Refugee Law.

This branch is one of the aspects of the international protection of the human person, in an attempt to ensure that those people who migrate in a forced way (due to persecution) have their human rights respected (Chetail, 2019). It is, therefore, the legal regime that protects the dignity of the human person internationally.

However, it was only after the Second World War that International Refugee Law received systematization, with the consequent adoption in 1951 of the Convention on the Status of Refugees (Hathaway, 1990; 134), which brings rights and duties, universal protection, principles of implementation, terms for inclusion, among other essential norms (Chetail, 2019), thus, outlining the legal contours of the legal definition of International Refugee Law.

Subsequently, the Protocol on Refugee Status expanded the concept, eliminating any type of previously existing temporal barrier, as a result of the context and historical moment of its negotiation, the 1951 Convention was originally limited in scope, due to the state's choices to ensure protection only to persons fleeing events occurring before 1 January 1951 and possibly within Europe, according to 1951 Convention, articles 1A, 1B and 2), thus receiving, after the Protocol of 67, character of universal protection.

Until today, the Convention of 51 remains the only universal instrument of hard law that provides a definition of refugee, being, therefore, essential for the protection of these people and the basic document in the structuring of the International Refugee Law considered, therefore, as the core of the protection regime, by implementing a true provision of human rights for the refugee population, being also the precursor of other normative documents, considered essential for the protection of the refugee population, as is the case of the New York Declaration for Refugees and Migrants 2016 and the 2018 Global Compact on Refugees (GCR). For this reason, the relationship between migration and development is foundational in the new attempts at global governance of forced migrations, such documents rescue the connection aspect of the International Refugee Law with human rights.

In this way, the international refugee regime places human rights as an essential guideline in its interpretation; a bond reinforces the idea of integral protection and, consequently, also drives a change in the structure of governance for the protection of this population, which, from then on, receives a guideline based on development which is a human right considered by itself (Jubilut; Casagrande, 2021, p. 465), as well as an instrumental right for the achievement of other human rights essential to dignity, which, ultimately, provokes the renewal of efforts to expand lasting solutions around integration, mainly in the context of local.

However, currently, the Convention of 51 and International Refugee Law itself suffer from (in addition to the considerable increase in the number of forcibly displaced people in the world, border closures due to COVID-19, politicization of nationalist and/or xenophobic discourses, among other extremely important factors at the international level that transform such individuals into “strangers” (Bauman, 2016) and, consequently, marginalized) the impacts of the deceleration of globalization worldwide, a phenomenon known as deglobalization.

3 TO CONDITIONING ISSUES OF THE MIGRATION DEVELOPMENT NEXUS

To understand the link between migration and development, it is important to understand its relationship with globalization. Therefore, this section will analyze the process of globalization, the crisis of globalization, also known as deglobalization, and the impacts on human rights.

3.1 Globalization

Globalization is not something new, but a trend that has characterized mankind since the beginning of time (HELD; McGrew, 2000:

7). It is a process that has been going on since humanity's remote past, gaining special momentum after World War II, especially with the global liberal order that was established in the aftermath (Held, 1995: 8).

From this influx, the movement of goods, capital and people across national borders increases, promoting market integration and interdependence. Contemporary globalization, however, has distinctive features and traces its origins back to the 1970s, largely to the wearing out of the Keynesian model and the development of communication technologies (Held, 2004: 2-12), favoring human mobility, the overflowing of borders and multifactorial spaces, the displacement of politics and economics and their modes of production and the transnationalization of these relations, typical of the globalized context that reaches the present day.

This, however, does not make its understanding one of the simplest tasks, as there is no single, defined concept for globalization (Held; McGrew, 2000: 7). As a starting point for examining some of the economic and political changes associated with its notion it is important to reflect on some of the ways in which its meaning has been used to inform contemporary policy debates.

Initially, it is necessary to point out that globalization implies the centralization of power in the hands of a few large organizations and perhaps even individuals (Allen, 2004: 8), to the detriment of the state. This notion is intertwined with the idea of power as domination, emphasizing the role of specific agents exercising power and influence over others (Dahl, 1957: 201).

In this context, central questions arise about the importance of the state itself for human organization, or rather, about the erosion of its power – and the reason for its very existence – in the face of globalization. In this respect, there are three theoretical positions in the literature on globalization: globalism, inter-nationalism and transformationalism (Held et al 1999: 2).

In short, globalists argue that we are living in an increasingly global era in which states are being submitted to more and more interference

from the economic system, leading to profound changes in political processes. These in turn are eroding and fragmenting nation-states, gradually diminishing state power. Under these circumstances, there are new patterns of economic power, with a more complex architecture, creating a new context of 'denationalization' of economies and policies of the states (Held et al 1999: 1-31), that is, their directive and command capacities are diminished, and they are only responding to demands, and even then in a reduced way, to the detriment of the creative potential to stimulate and promote new issues. In this sense, the migration of highly skilled people, those who work in commerce and in the highly specialized labor market, and those who work in the tourism industry and international travel are encouraged (Money, 2021: 5).

Inter-nationalists strongly resist this view and believe that contemporary global circumstances have been overestimated. The intensification of globalization has stimulated social interactions and this has reinforced and strengthened the powers of the state in many places. Therefore, new institutions are being built in order to respond in every possible way to the challenges posed by the new reality (Held et al 1999: 1-31). From this perspective, migration has always been protected by the interests of national states that have always regulated it, under the justification of the principles of sovereignty and equality among states (Money, 2021: 1).

Transformationalists take a different position. They argue that globalization creates new economic, political, and social circumstances that are transforming state powers and the context in which states operate. They do not predict the outcome - which remains uncertain - but they believe that politics is no longer, and cannot simply be, based on the traditional format of nation-states. The socio-spatial context of states is being changed, and so are their nature, form, and operations (Held et al 1999: 1-31). Thus, migrations, although they remain regulated by the states in their portion of power and sovereignty, start to have their regulation shared with extra-state and international entities, proper of the migratory regimes (Money, 2021).

In any case, current patterns of globalization raise profound questions about how contemporary societies are governed and how they should be, normatively speaking. Globalists argue that in a globalized world, states and national governments are increasingly powerless and irrelevant, because international economic patterns are highlighted. While they are too small to deal with the problems that affect them, such as increased cross-border human mobility, they are too big to deal with local issues, such as the welcoming and receiving environment. On the other hand, inter-nationalists maintain that the ability of national governments to regulate the lives of their citizens and manage global affairs has never been more extensive. Rather than the end of the nation-state, inter-nationalists conclude that globalization is reaffirming the centrality of national governments in managing human affairs, and therefore human mobility would never have been so regulated, as states have always sought to limit it (MONEY, 2021), even in the face of the volume of investment and capital movement befitting globalization. Transformationalists disagree with both arguments by arguing that in the world created by the forces of globalization, national governments are having to adapt their roles and functions. As a result, a significant reconfiguration in the power, jurisdiction, authority, and legitimacy of states is underway (McGrew, 2004: 125-126).

From a transformationalist perspective, national governments do not have so much power to lose, but they have to adjust to a new context in which their power and sovereignty remain in competition and are constantly interchanged among many other public and private agencies above, below and beside the nation-state (McGrew, 2004: 126), governance mechanisms that operate at multiple levels and layers. The big question it poses lies exactly at the point where flaws are evident in the mechanisms of global governance, in particular, the migratory.

The increasing interconnection between these mechanisms of multilevel governance not only generates animosities and conflicts, but can also fuel reactionary politics and entrenched xenophobia. Since a

significant segment of the world's population is not directly affected by globalization, or is excluded from its benefits, it becomes a deeply divisive and therefore vigorously contested process. The inequality of globalization ensures that it is far from being a universal, uniformly experienced process (Held and McGrew, 2000: 13-14). Here then is its counter-movement, the deglobalization process.

3.2 Deglobalization

With the deceleration of globalization, a new set of problems has been added to the global liberal order, which is increasingly less receptive to migration, even in the face of the three globalization perspectives studied. This movement points to what some theorists call “deglobalization” in order to indicate the current global deceleration of integration processes, including migration, both from the economic and political perspective.

In the economic sphere, the scenario is the worst since the “great depression” of 1929 as well as the realization of socioeconomic inequalities that affect the entire world; from the political perspective, international cooperation processes have never been so weakened – scenarios enhanced by the pandemic of COVID-19, which, in turn, has repercussions in several areas (Jubilut and Alves, 2021). Deglobalization, thus, translates the idea of an era marked by economic slowdown and difficulties in the operationalization of global governance mechanisms, which bring as a result very clearly identifiable concrete effects, both from the economic and the political point of view, which is why its approach is relevant to understanding the relationship between migration and development, especially in the current scenario and if one wants to face the depolitization of the debates in forced migration.

From the perspective of economics, deglobalization is analyzed since 2008 crisis. This is because with the Washington Consensus and the opening of markets that followed, a new reality was imposed on

national states: fiscal discipline, stimulus to financial investments, and privatization of public companies, in order to promote trade opening and deregulation (Faria, 2004). Once the economies were integrated, human mobility also followed this movement.

Thus, with globalization, important transformations have occurred at the level of the economy. With the liberalization of the international market, the mobility of capital took place. We then see its reconfiguration, consistent with the passage from industrial capital to financialized capital, leading to increasing volatility (Faria, 2004: 169). From then on, the mobility of capital accelerated exponentially and the industrial system was modified, leaving the mass production and starting to adapt to the “post-Fordist flexibility”, in which instead of favoring the Fordist mass production, it starts to prioritize the productive flexibility, to meet more specific publics (Tenório, 2011: 1141). These combined transformations reverberated in other domains.

With the increasingly integrated and interdependent economies, the balance between the market and the state has been altered, clearly undermining the state’s autonomy and capacity for political-economic and even normative action, a scenario in which other types of relations have developed and other actors have emerged in the relationship between states, such as the World Trade Organization, the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, in addition to the supranational bodies arising from the economic blocs.

With the “crash” of the international economic and financial system in 2008 and the crisis that followed, the effects of intensifying globalization were unveiled. The overvaluation of the market, transnationalization, and deregulation have produced vertiginous economic and social disparities and inequalities. This is because capital has in itself the capacity of self-reproduction, causing the rich to become richer and the poor to become poorer (Piketty, 2014: 543).

Economic globalization has provided great rates of economic growth, but the liberal international order, while remaining indifferent to distributing wealth more equitably, has helped create its own

opponents. The global export volume of trade in goods, which was \$3.495 trillion in 1990, jumped to \$19.45 trillion in 2018. Global gross domestic product grew from \$84.149 trillion in 2009 to \$142 trillion in 2019. The richest economies account for two-thirds of these figures. Within these states, however, the distribution of wealth remains extremely skewed and the gap between rich and poor is widening. On top of all this, the 2020 and 2021 blockades introduced in response to the COVID-19 pandemic are further widening the gap between rich and poor (Kornprobst and Paul, 2021: 22).

The deepening of socioeconomic inequalities experienced worldwide provoked reactions in the political system, which started to adopt more restrictive measures to integrationist processes, imposing the deceleration of globalization and, in turn, of international cooperation (Alves, 2024).

With economic globalization slowing significantly in recent years, a new set of problems awaits the liberal international order. The sharp fall in foreign direct investment, for example, is likely to have serious repercussions. It is expected to almost halve investment flows to Africa, Asia, and Latin America. Contrary to hopes of meeting the Sustainable Development Goals, millions of people may be thrown back into poverty. Although the number of refugees is already at a record level, significantly more people could join the global increase in refugees. Social unrest and more authoritarian tendencies in host states could be the result. It is doubtful that the global governance mechanisms established by the liberal global international order when it was still strong will be able to deal with these challenges (Kornprobst and Paul, 2021).

This scenario was further aggravated by the political and social crises stemming from the dysfunctions of the governance mechanisms that had been building up since the so-called “failed wars” in the Middle East in the post-September 11 period (Held, 2016:71).

In a context where there is great financial market instability, economic imbalance, global poverty and inequality – problems aggravated

by terrorism, unregulated nuclear exploitation and the growth of the arms industry, transnational cooperation becomes increasingly ineffective and degraded (Held, 2016:71). This context points to what David Held, Kevin Young, and Thomas Hale (2013) call “gridlock,” to describe the main characteristic of today: paralysis and isolation, states averse to integration and collaborationism, making cooperation increasingly difficult and deficient, just when it is most needed and urgent.

These transformations are also sources of tension between global politics favorable to globalization and markets, the erosion of sovereignty, and social stability within states. Dani Rodrik (1997) points to three major causes of this epiphenomenon, as follows.

First, trade barriers between states once reduced to trade and investment have accentuated the asymmetry between groups that can and cannot cross international borders. In the first category reside the owners of capital and highly skilled workers, free to take their resources and productive capital where there is the greatest demand. In the second is unskilled, medium or low skilled labor that can be easily replaced, outside of national borders. This makes this second category more “elastic”, because it implies the precarization of labor, both in terms of facts and of law: one, because there is greater difficulty in implementing improvements and labor benefits; two, because these workers must endure greater instability in earnings and hours worked, in addition to greater volatility of labor relations themselves; three, because the bargaining power of these workers is eroded and the protection of labor rights is weakened, given the extreme ease of substitution (Rodrik, 1997: 6-7).

Second, globalization generates conflicting relationships concerning national norms and the social institutions that embody them, both within and outside states. As the technology of production becomes increasingly specialized and internationally diffused, nation-states with very different beliefs, values, norms, and institutions begin to compete for trade on very unequal terms as they have too

disparate levels of development. This leads to the institutional weakening of nation-states through trade (Rodrik, 1997: 8-9). Moreover, the standardization and harmonization of rules among states, aimed at increasing cross-border commercial activity is a reality since the intensification of globalization in the 1990s, also transforming their institutions and directly confronting the sovereignty of states.

Third, globalization has made it difficult for states to implement social security mechanisms – one of their primary functions and one that has favored the maintenance of social and political cohesion at home as well as the post-war global order. With globalization, states are finding it difficult to ensure citizen's rights, as well as to guarantee the adequate provision of public services. States are gradually reducing their social obligations, especially those related to public social security. This is because with the increasing mobility of capital, states are faced with challenges concerning tax flexibility and collection difficulties in order to maintain the public machine (Rodrik, 1997: 10).

As a consequence of these tensions, a new class division is solidified in globalized societies: between those who have prospered in the globalized economy and those who have not. This leads to divisions between those who share the same values and those who don't; between those who can diversify their risks and capital and those who cannot. This leads to a deepening of social fissures (Rodrik, 1997: 10) within states, leading to tensions, destabilization, antagonisms, and, finally, the erosion of social ties. Hence, the need for states to control the harmful effects of economic globalization through deglobalization.

From the perspective of politics, unlike economics, studies of deglobalization point much more to problems of geopolitics and to failures arising from the governance mechanisms established in the post-war period than to economic factors. This suggests that deglobalization has much deeper roots than economic analyses indicate, even if one takes into account the importance of economic issues, which, in turn, are articulated with international economic policy (Alves, 2024).

Thinking about the economic and financial crises of contemporary capital as a triggering factor for deglobalization necessarily implies disregarding that the crises of contemporary capital are recurrent and do not always generate deglobalization processes, as exemplified by the recent crises (Hoekman, 2015; Bordo, 2017) in Asia, in 1997 (Fischer, 1998), in Russia, in 1998 (United Nations, 2020), and in Brazil, as of 2011 (Serrano and Summa, 2015; Gillespie, 2015). In view of this argument, one can point to the fact that the 2008 crisis, which is directly related to the current deglobalization process, was triggered by the central states, unlike the previous crises listed here. However, as a counter-argument, it is possible to think of the protagonism that states located outside the North Atlantic axis, considered economically central, have assumed since the 1990s, as pointed out by studies on the Global South.

At the same time, it is impossible to forget that significant changes have occurred, both locally and globally. One of the most striking facts of recent political evolution is the erosion of sovereignty in the context of contemporary globalization, making porous the relationships between the internal and the international, the “inside” and the “outside”. The emergence of governance mechanisms, public and private, demonstrates that far beyond politics, administration and the production of law have also been delocalized from the state paradigm (Alves, 2024).

With globalization, the global order has become highly entangled by trade, finance, communication, pollutants, violence, and many other factors that flow across national borders. This has created a vulnerability in the global framework: actions that used to be localized no longer are, as they directly affect lives in other distant corners of the world and vice versa (Held, Hale and Young, 2013). There is a growing gap between the needs for global solutions and the signaling ability of multilateral institutions to find them (Held, Hale and Young, 2013). This represents the collapse of global cooperation and highlights the crisis in the globalization process: deglobalization, which, by the way, directly affects migration, reducing it.

This is because with the failures of global governance mechanisms, states have resumed sovereign powers in an attempt to better control political action and the regulation of globalized, transnational spaces, revealing a hybrid sovereignty, guided both by globalization and its internationalization processes and reinforced by Westphalian patterns of centrality and concentration of power (Alves, 2021).

Thus, migrations are understood both as a necessity of the globalized society, attending to the post-war global liberal order, formatted by economic interdependence, democracy, human rights and multilateralism, even if in a reduced form, and the sovereign standards of concentration of power in the state sphere, with limitations to these postulates, this facet with greater force, directly affecting the right to migrate – much more related to the preferences of the states than in attendance to the principles of the globalized liberal order (Money, 2021: 2).

If, on the one hand, sovereignty guarantees states the control of their borders to admit or refuse people, on the other hand, International Law requires that states allow their citizens to freely leave and return to their places of origin. The issue that deglobalization highlights is the superimposition of state sovereignty in the face of International Law (Alves, 2024), especially in relation to forced migration, leading to the understanding that the theme is permeated only by standards related to the normativity, being seen, therefore, in a depoliticized way when it is not.

Deglobalization, analyzed from the perspective of politics, i.e., through the lens of the failures of global governance mechanisms, and, therefore, of increased sovereignty to the detriment of the international context and, therefore, of International Law, reveals that the patterns of acceptance of migration flows, arising from the sovereign principle, are predominantly unilateral (Money, 2021: 14), i.e., they reflect the policies adopted by a given state and not necessarily, a pure and simple consequence of its legal system, nor of International Law.

At the level of International Law, the right to migrate is assured, but at the state level, externalities of political sovereignty are evidenced to the extent that it encompasses negotiation by states to control the entry and exit of citizens and non-citizens, to prevent individuals from seeking asylum and refuge by increasing documentation requirements (Money, 2021: 18-19). The agreements signed between 2015 and 2016 between the European Union and Turkey to prevent Syrian refugees in Turkey, as well as migrants in transit from leaving, preventing them from seeking refuge through these mechanisms, are very illustrative examples of this reality. This practice evidences a deglobalized context, of increased state powers, in which bilateral relations are given prestige, to the detriment of globalized and multilateral logic, pro-human rights (Alves, 2024). The COVID-19 pandemic reinforces this assertion, with operational rules and procedures that further restrict freedom of movement and limit human rights protection (Money, 2021:2).

As noted, in the context permeated by globalization, the cross-border movement of people in a liberal international order is naturalized. In a deglobalized scenario, however, travelers, workers, and refugees start to suffer exclusions, from the inversion of the logic of more national and less international, that is, from the adoption of methods, procedures, and policies that give prestige to the national scope of states (Alves, 2023), allowing them, within the existing rules, to select immigrants and determine migratory flows according to their own preferences.

If, on the one hand, international law prescribes the right of return to the migrant, on the other, state sovereignty guarantees control over the entry of people into each state's territory, and, in the face of the deglobalized context, in which the national is superimposed over the international, there is an evident imbalance. The inequalities between the right of exit and the right of entry give destination states the power to classify immigrants based on desired characteristics and to determine the level of cross-border movement of people (Money, 2021: 23). There is, therefore, little need for multilateral institutions

to act and increase for this purpose, especially since externalities can be dealt with more simply and less expensively on a bilateral basis, quite characteristic of deglobalization (Alves, 2024).

3.3 Human Rights

However, it is not possible to give credibility or any kind of continuity to a model of international relationships without the counterpoint of distributive justice in the international scenario. Because, apart from the processes of competition (and/or isolation) of the states, it is necessary to create a strategic form of equitable affirmation of human rights, since, under the mantle of an unbridled deglobalization, there are in game the security of the international community and, above all, the dignity of the human person (Bierman; Pattberg, 2012).

This is because, the scenario of competitiveness implemented by deglobalization is marked by a growing vision of intolerance, egocentrism and xenophobia, which, consequently, creates more hostility instead of distributing human rights and fundamental freedoms. This scenario closes the cycle of achievements made over decades in terms of dignity to build a hostile and nationalist process (Said, 2007: 26).

On the other hand, it is necessary to implement again multilateral efforts for the positive construction of a unified global agenda and based mainly on the series of rights already historically affirmed, on the fundamental freedoms conquered and on the values of equality.

Such human rights standards cannot be revoked in the name of a global logic for national security (regardless of which aspect is analyzed, as is the case of financial security or against terror) (Pierik, 2004). So, given the importance of human rights, the theme becomes a crucial point for international agendas bearing in mind the dignity of the human person, as Sérgio Vieira de Mello already said: “It must be clear that the time has come for all states to redefine global security, placing human rights at the heart of this debate” (Mello, 2004: 172)

and about this point is necessary to think about deglobalization like a form to get security, because:

In an insecure world, security is the name of the game, your main objective and your ultimate bet. Security is a value that, if not in theory, at least in practice, reduces and distances all others, including those proclaimed as “those that are most dear to us”, which is why they are the main targets of hatred and the strongest cause of “their” desire, “the ones out there”, to do us harm – the impulse that makes the whole world unsafe, as well as this part of “here” – which we call home. In an insecure world like ours, everything we used to associate with democracy, such as personal freedom to speak and act, the right to privacy, access to the truth, can collide with the supreme need for security and, therefore, must be cut or suspended (Bauman, 2006: 36-37).

Within this reality, it is necessary to create structural responses capable of meeting the needs of human dignity, with the help that goes beyond the classic geopolitical boundaries established by the states (which become more diluted in this new logic), affecting society, culture, economy, among other essential branches.

Despite the deglobalization, states continue to participate in the international arena in the formulation of public policies in favor of human rights share it with other players such as multinational companies, non-governmental organizations, scientific and academic communities, mass communication vehicles, among other actors of international influence, in a constitution oriented to dignity (Noortmann, 2001).

This is because human rights are, without a doubt, the only possible expression for the integration and legitimization of international action aimed at safeguarding human dignity itself from the various possible forms of violation.

States, international organizations and non-state actors begin to dialogue to create mechanisms to face the challenges of this century,

while also proposing ways to obtain the right to development, under the lens of the implementation of human rights and fundamental freedoms, even in the face of desglobalization scenario.

4 THE SOLIDARITY CITY INITIATIVE AS AN EXAMPLE FOR ASSESSING THE DEVELOPMENT MIGRATION NEXUS TROUGH A DEGLOBALIZATION AND HUMAN RIGHTS LENS

Faced with the reality of these global issues, the discourse about human rights gains weight and importance, as discussions about globalization intensify conflicts and, consequently, produce inequalities and a pattern of competition, creating shared risks that need to be managed by everyone. Such risks create, therefore, the need to implement, apply and develop human rights in the face of the social injustices of a fragmented international society.

This is because globalization – remembering that it is a multidimensional and historical concept, has had a significant impact on society over the last decade, particularly on the development of the life course, determining patterns of social life which also has a multifaceted concept, impacting worldwide connections and social phenomena, local and global, but also resulting in impacts on global distributive processes. Deglobalization can thus be understood as a manner of explaining globalization and is not inherently at odds with the concept of globalization.

Through this perspective, deglobalization is a description of the present stage of globalization which in turn highlights its flaws to allow for its betterment. Understanding deglobalization and its impacts in the international scenario is paramount to international law generally and particularly to international cooperation, given that international norms and actions do not exist in a vacuum but rather are conditioned by exogenous elements in terms of their creation and effective cooperation (Jubilut and Alves, 2021).

From an economic standpoint, most scholars present the recent economic-financial crisis, which have financialization, income inequality, and wealth concentration as their main foundations, as the reasons for deglobalization, especially the 2008 crisis. Consequently, social gaps worsen, leading in turn to tensions, instability, and antagonisms (Held, 2016).

But the history of globalization is not just that. There are positive impacts such as the internationalization of human rights and the ones deriving from its centripetal forces, which bring along states' cooperation and the realization of the existence of global issues that demand global action (Held, 2016b, p. 16). For this reason, we prefer to analyze deglobalization from the perspective of international politics. Because from that perspective, deglobalization shows the challenges facing globalization as a way to enable new avenues to correct courses.

The decrease in multilateral relations and the difficulties in and for international cooperation are prime examples of those political changes. With globalization, transnational relations have exponentially increased in the global order. This has created vulnerabilities in the global structure. Thus, a complex net of international cooperation has been created to deal with the new demands posed by these new relations. However, nowadays, there is a gap between the need for global solutions and the ability of multilateral institutions to find or provide them (Hale, Held and Young, 2013).

Besides the paths of deglobalization issues that had already been building up over time and within the post-war global order, there is yet another important component of the current political impasse to be considered as a factor that, added to this state of affairs, has driven the deglobalization process up to the present day: the degradation of the post-September 11 political context.

David Held (2016) asserts that the terrorist attacks of September 11, constitute crimes committed not only against the United States (USA), but against humanity. The question that arises refers to the US

response in the face of them, importing new crimes, attacks against citizens around the world, democracy, justice and the rule of law. But not only that: the war in Iraq (and later in Afghanistan, Libya, and Syria), weakened International Law and human rights and then the international institutions, and finally political stability, initially in the Middle East, and then, worldwide.

This process of political degradation that permeates deglobalization has led to a process of renationalization of politics and law, leading to a logic of more national and less international, which implies affirming a greater concentration of power and sovereignty within national states, to the detriment of cooperation and international law, leading to damage to human rights globally, as well as a reduction in the development of spaces for the protection of people in refugee situations, in accordance with international refugee law.

To face the current political impasse that deglobalization represents, some paths have been outlined, based on the studies of David Held and Thomas Hale (2017: 14-21). They are designed to unlock the political deadlock, in different areas, not to solve the problems faced by refugees or forced migrations specifically. But they can point to productive alternatives. In this sense, improving the global governance system is very important and can happen in three ways: (i) bottom-up pressure: movements and coalitions drawn from civil society should seek to forge cooperative ties with reform-minded governments to advance the solution of issues important to the 21st century with collaboration of the state power. Otherwise, they will simply emerge, attract some degree of attention, but then disappear; (ii) horizontal pressure: when institutions gain autonomy and can adapt and act on their own, an important driver of change emerges (for example: trade dispute settlement mechanisms developed by the World Trade Organization, which despite resistance from member countries, has managed to impose its decisions); (iii) Top-down actions: there are times when states, especially those with greater resources, manage to be efficient in combating serious problems.

And, beyond deglobalization and the current political impasse David Held and Thomas Hale (2017: 14–21) assert: (i) Shifts in the core interests of great powers: deglobalization can provoke or exacerbate systemic or regional crises, but can also create incentives for great powers to provide global public goods; (ii) Autonomy and adaptation of international institutions: the accumulation of authority in some international institutions has made them increasingly autonomous from the interests of their members; some international organizations have rule-making capacities to adapt to new circumstances; (iii) Technical groups with effective and legitimate processes: subject areas delegated by states to experts are relatively insulated from stalemate tendencies; transparent and rational procedures add legitimacy to technocratic decision-making; (iv) Multiple and diverse organizations and institutions unite around common goals/norms: possible for “additive” or “expansionist” contexts, not for “absolute” thematic areas; diffusion and consolidation of common principles, norms and goals in a policy domain. Well-designed and articulated networks can provide effective governance in different areas; (v) Mobilizing domestic constituents for cooperation and compliance: socializing communities of actors into particular practices and norms; institutional channels give strength to national and regional actors; global governance can shift the interests of states in ways that promote cooperation over time, for example by “socializing” states into cooperative patterns or by creating and strengthening domestic interest groups that seek greater cooperation. For example: domestic pro-human rights organizations that project themselves globally; (vi) Civil society allied with states and focused on reform: coalitions across state–civil society boundaries generate new political possibilities; without challenging the core interests of core states. Some of the greatest successes in global governance in the 1990s came from civil society efforts, together with states (for example, Landmine Ban Treaty); (vii) Innovative leadership as a reaction to “gridlock”: deglobalization provokes innovative and entrepreneurial strategies (norms of entrepreneurship). The deglobalization crisis can

generate innovative behaviors and strategies by the various actors in global governance to combat it by reformatting the rules of the game (for example: campaign for the Responsibility to Protect; for the creation of the International Criminal Court) (Hale, Held, 2017:17-21).

Hence, new mechanisms emerge; that reinterpret classic and current concepts of International Law, to consider the inclusion of the focus-axis of human rights mainly for those who have been deprived of – almost – everything, as the migrants. Therefore, the concept of human rights offers vital capabilities, favoring a transformation towards greater equality, especially in global flows and its distributive effects and can offer solutions for deglobalization problems in this case for migrants.

These are mandatory measures practiced in order to integrate the community in the path of the right to development under the lens of human rights even in periods of deglobalization, including for forced migrations.

And, international cooperation is essential for the protection of migrants, and most importantly in the case of refugees. This is reinforced by the Global Compact on Refugees (GCR). Its four main goals are to ease the pressure on host countries; enhance refugees selfreliance; expand access to third-country solutions; and support conditions in countries of origin for a safe and dignified return, with responsibility-sharing and an effective international collaborative action – all impacted by deglobalization (Alves, 2022a). But the role of several stakeholders in building global migration governance cannot be forgotten.

The GCR highlights that global migration governance and international cooperation are fundamental to the protection of the right to migrate and both continue to be active, even if with reduced strength. This is because the globalization process is not linear and deglobalization is not a mirror movement, because of the power struggle between state sovereignty and the governance that globalization engenders (Alves, 2022b). Thus, it is still possible to note

that despite the deglobalized scenario that imposes difficulties for migrations, especially the forced ones, they can still be managed by global migration governance, taking into account the International Human Rights Law. Moreover, it is necessary to consider that states have important regulatory powers, something that overrides in the deglobalized scenario (Alves, 2024).

This is the case of the 2004 Mexico Action Plan, which creates the Sustainable Cities Program (ACNUR, 2004) reaffirmed years later with the Declaration and Plan of Action of Brazil, in 2014 (ACNUR, 2014). This is an initiative based on solidarity efforts that recognizes the efforts of local governments to formulate and implement various “public policies that promote the collection, access to rights and integration of people who are forced to leave their countries of origin in search of protection” (UNHCR, 2002: 1), integrating cities, local actors and refugees, with a focus on development to help refugee receiving countries namely those with solidary borders and solidary cities.

The role of actors and local government authorities is central to the implementation of public policies that ensure that refugees and migration populations can exercise their rights (and duties), such as housing, education, health and social assistance, among others.

This is because such rights derive from adequate social planning, mainly at the local level, which allows the development of human actions with the viability of alternative creations for granting equal rights, mainly with regard to quality of life, in addition to the dissemination of knowledge focused on the inclusion of the migrant community, especially with regard to the challenges of preventing discrimination, dropping out of school, unworthy work, in addition to all forms of violence and exploitation.

In this way, the protection and integration of the refugee and migration population are shared and complementary, in an approach that must be taken by the whole of society (ACNUR, 2022; p. 13), in a construction of distribution of responsibilities, economic

burdens and also collective and sustainable solutions, mainly at the municipal level given that, this is the first place to welcome the migrant population.

In this sense, progress is shown in the creation of advisory or deliberative committees and councils for refugees and migrants. Currently, there are 26 committees and councils in Brazil, being 15 municipal and 11 state, linked to social assistance and/or human rights, which become mechanisms that allow participation, in addition to the articulation between actors and government agents in the search for joint solutions (ACNUR, 2022; p. 16-17), enactment of municipal laws on the subject which define principles of municipal action, in order to guarantee access to fundamental rights, in addition to equal treatment, with the purpose of cohesion between the municipal social departments (ACNUR, 2022; p. 17), and, the elaboration of management plans, with the objective of establishing measures for the deepening established public policies (that supports and guides the execution of municipal public policies, being an essential component for the development and determination of priorities for the next years of management. At the moment, three refugee and migration management plans are in operation in Brazil, being two state and one municipal (ACNUR, 2022; p. 18).

Added to these efforts are the reference services in assisting the refugee and migrant population promoted by municipal bodies, in conjunction with other state public services. These are good practices that promote the development, protection and local integration of refugee and migrant populations in a lasting and sustainable way (Global Compact on Refugees Digital Platform, 2021; online).

Take, for example: a) shelters for migrants even, in some places, exclusive to the elderly population (ACNUR, 2020; online) or to the population of indigenous origin (ACNUR, 2020, online), which provide temporary shelter for migrants and refugees in vulnerable situations; b) spaces for intercultural mediation, with health care and social assistance, incentives for employability, obtaining

documentation, provision of information on basic rights, educational guidance and listening to migrants and refugees (Silva, 2017). These places provide services in a humanized and integrated way, being references in the area, including mapping for knowledge of the profile and demands, in order to adequately plan municipal actions (ACNUR, 2022; p. 51); c) the creation of a care network for the migrant and refugee population (for the construction of a permanent space for collective cooperation in order to promote full access to rights, especially for vulnerable groups, such as people with reduced mobility and/or disabilities, children and adolescents, women, among others) (ACNUR, 2022; p. 68-72); d) educational actions, with the insertion of refugee and migrant students in municipal schools, in order to guarantee their correct enrollment in a grade or school stage (ACNUR, 2019; online) (Breitenvieser; Tubini, 2018); among others.

Thus, the public initiatives of solidarity cities corroborate the international debate on the role of cities in the integration, protection and development of migrant and refugee populations, proving that the local scope, that is, the cities that act more directly in the scope of these public policies, through important work at the local level has an immense and effective contribution to obtaining quality of life and human rights for this population in a vulnerable situation, through the achievement of local social cohesion for refugees and migrants living in cities, with good reception and integration practices, in addition to other basic services that are promoted for the benefit of people seeking international protection, built in a participatory manner and aimed at the full integration of people of other nationalities in the services offered by the municipality through an approach that must be sensitive and respectful of the cultural and traditional values of this population, while guaranteeing dignified conditions and access to basic needs, mainly with regard to social human rights, such as housing, education and health care in new local households after sheltering in place.

Thus, the relevance of cities in the context of obtaining human rights for the migrant and refugee population (by serving as reception and integration in large urban centers, in search of security, economic opportunities for self-sufficiency and, of course, human development, through implementing effective assistance offering strategies, such as the examples of good practices, like Brazil and Mexico, mentioned above, which, ultimately, can contribute to promoting inclusion and social cohesion, thus reducing local inequalities), being one of the most important actors in the context of this governance.

In this sense, GCR recognizes the contribution of cities and their local governments to the consolidation of human protection, which, in turn, also contributes to the socioeconomic development of the place.

It is therefore necessary to recognize that the local environment plays an essential role in the planning of public services and the creation of innovative development tools, with, consequently, the creation of effective solutions to the challenges of migration and deglobalization.

It remains clear that the objectives of the GCR will only be promoted with the support and involvement of everyone given that it establishes a structure for dividing responsibilities in an equitable manner, recognizing that lasting solutions will only be implemented through cooperation and governance, mainly from local public and private entities, aiming to create development opportunities and reduce inequalities. It is, therefore, an opportunity to transform the destiny aiming at the right to development of both the refugee and migrant population, as well as the local communities that host them, acting within the framework of the four main objectives of the Pact: reducing the pressure on host countries; increase self-sufficiency; expand access to third-country solutions; and support conditions in the countries of origin for safe and dignified return, given that such initiatives also dialogue with the Sustainable Development Goal 11, of the 2030 Agenda, which has the goal precisely to build more sustainable, inclusive, safe and resilient cities.

5 CONCLUSIONS

There are several causes of migration. In the case of forced migration, several reasons can be given, such as immigration policies, human rights violations, persecution, violence, demographic and environmental changes, food insecurity, environmental disasters and/or climate change, labor and employment needs, among others. Therefore, it is common to associate forced migration and development, especially in the face of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

With globalization and incentives for the movement of goods and people, this reality was favored by international cooperation provided by global migration governance mechanisms. However, with deglobalization, this context is highly impacted. The deglobalization process, analyzed from both an economic and political perspective, indicates that migration is highly disadvantaged, as is the overall human rights context.

And much of the time, the difficulties imposed on the human right to migrate is attributed to each state's own normative set, as a result of the principle of sovereignty, leading to the understanding that migration and development should be seen in a depoliticized way, when they are not.

For this reason, the analyses in the face of deglobalization, from the perspective of politics, reveal that the failures of the mechanisms of global migration governance are much more important than the economic reasons indicate. But still, the role of the various stakeholders in global migration governance cannot be disregarded, as international cooperation still persists with deglobalization, even if with reduced strength. This is because the examples of Mexico and Brazil demonstrate exactly the opposite – human rights and the right to development must prevail as interpretative keys.

In this way, it is clear that the construction of a local and/or municipal policy for the migrant and refugee population has been essential, in order to determine effective principles and guidelines

aimed at public administration at the municipal level, which can strengthen the ways of local integration and protection.

The construction of this local policy has been carried out with existing participatory mechanisms, as well as spaces for creating new ones, in a strategy to integrate these populations into political, social and cultural life at the local level.

6 REFERENCES

ACNUR. **I Relatório cidades solidárias Brasil: proteção e integração de pessoas refugiadas no plano local**. Brasília: ACNUR, 2022.

ACNUR. **Inédita interiorização de idosos venezuelanos é realizada com apoio do ACNUR**. 2020. Available at: <https://www.acnur.org/portugues/2020/12/02/inedita-interiorizacao-de-idoso-venezuelanos-e-realizada-com-apoio-do-acnur>.

ACNUR. **Novo abrigo aprimora acolhimento de refugiados e migrantes indígenas venezuelanos em Manaus**. 2020. Available at: <https://www.acnur.org/portugues/2020/07/15/novo-abrigo-aprimora-acolhimento-de-refugiados-e-migrantes-indigenas-venezuelanos-em-Manaus>.

ACNUR. **Professores concluem formação sobre o tema do refúgio em São Paulo**. 2019. Available at: <https://www.acnur.org/portugues/2019/12/16/professores-concluem-formacao-sobre-o-tema-do-refugio-em-Sao-Paulo>.

ACNUR. **Declaração e Plano de Ação do México para Fortalecer a Proteção Internacional dos Refugiados na América Latina**. 2004. Available at: https://www.acnur.org/fileadmin/Documentos/portugues/BD_Legal/Instrumentos_Internacionais/Declaracao_e_Plano_de_Acao_do_Mexico.pdf.

ACNUR. **Declaration and Plan of Action of Brazil**. 2014. Available at: <https://www.unhcr.org/brazil-declaration.html>.

ALLEN, John. Power: its institutional guises (and disguises). In: HUGHES, Gordon; FERGUSON, Ross (Eds.). **Ordering lives: family, work and welfare**. London: Routledge, 2004. p. 8–42.

ALVES, Angela Limongi. **Globalização, desglobalização e impactos na soberania estatal**. Belo Horizonte: Fórum-Del Rey, 2024.

ALVES, Angela Limongi. Protection of refugees, international cooperation and challenges in the face of the deglobalization process. In: JUBILUT, Liliana Lyra et al. **IASFM19 – 19th International Association for Study of Forced Migration Conference: accepted abstracts**. Santos: Leopoldianum, 2022. p. 119.

ALVES, Angela Limongi. Sobre a soberania e a governança: itinerários para a construção de novos conceitos. **Novos Estudos Jurídicos**, Itajaí, v. 27, n. 1, p. 22–48, 2022.

BAUMAN, Zygmunt. **Strangers at our door**. Polity Press, 2016.

BAUMAN, Zygmunt. **Europa: uma aventura inacabada**. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar, 2006.

BIERMANN, Frank; PATTBERG, Philipp. **Global Environmental Governance Reconsidered**. Cambridge/London: The MIT Press, 2012.

BORDO, Michael. The second era of globalization is not yet over: an historical perspective. In: **National Bureau of Economic Research – Re-inventing Bretton Woods Conference: living without globalization**. Cambridge, v. 6, p. 1–21, 2017.

BREITENVIESER, Camila Barreiro; TUBINI, J. M. S. Nada sobre mim, sem mim: espaços de participação social na política para migrantes de São Paulo. In: **XVII Semana de Pós-Graduação em Ciências Sociais da UNESP/FCLAR: Disputas hegemônicas e processos emancipatórios no Brasil contemporâneo**. Anais de eventos. São Paulo, 2018.

CHETAIL, Vincent. **International Migration Law**. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019.

DAHL, Robert. The concept of power. **Behavioral Science**, 1957, p. 156–201.

FARIA, José Eduardo. **O direito na economia globalizada**. São Paulo: Malheiros, 2004.

FISCHER, Stanley. The Asian crisis: causes and cures. **Finance and Development**, New York, v. 35, n. 2, June, p. 1–42, 1998.

GILLESPIE, Patrick. **Brazil falls deep into recession**. CNN, New York, 28 Aug. 2015. Available at: <https://money.cnn.com/2015/08/28/news/economy/brazil-recession/>.

GLOBAL COMPACT ON REFUGEES DIGITAL PLATFORM. **What is a good practice?**. 2021. Available at: <https://globalcompactrefugees.org/article/waht-good-practice>.

HALE, Thomas; HELD, David; YOUNG, Kevin. **Gridlock: why global cooperation is falling when we need it most**. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2013.

HALE, Thomas; HELD, David. **Beyond gridlock**. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2017.

HATHAWAY, James. A reconsideration of the underlying premise of refugee law. **Harvard International Law Journal**, v. 31, n. 1, p. 129–147, 1990.

HELD, David. **Democracy and the global order: from the modern State to cosmopolitan governance**. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1995.

HELD, David. Introduction. In: HELD, David (Ed.). **A globalizing world? Culture, economic, politics**. London: Routledge, 2004. p. 1–5.

HELD, David. **Broken politics: from 9/11 to the present**. Durham: Durham University – Global Policy Journal; Wiley Blackwell, 2016.

HELD, David. **Global politics after 9/11: failed wars, political fragmentation and the rise of authoritarianism**. London: Global Policy, 2016b.

HELD, David; MACGREW, Anthony. **An introduction to the globalization debate**. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2000.

HELD, David; MCGREW, Anthony; GOLDBLATT, David; PERRATON, Jonathan. **Global transformations: politics, economics and culture**. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999.

HOEKMAN, Bernard. **The global trade slowdown: a new normal?** London: Centre for Economic Policy Research, 2015.

JUBILUT, Liliana Lyra; ALVES, Angela Limongi. The COVID-19 pandemic in a time of deglobalization: challenges and perspectives for global governance and international cooperation. **Denver Journal of International Law**, Denver, v. 49, n. 1, p. 1–12, 2021.

JUBILUT, Liliana Lyra; CASAGRANDE, Melissa Martins. The continued pivotal role of the 1951 Convention in Refugee Protection: evidences from dialogues with Latin American Refugee Law and the GCR. In: **Direitos Humanos e Vulnerabilidade e Direito Internacional dos Refugiados**. Boa Vista: Editora da UFRR, 2021.

KORNPROBST, Markus; PAUL, Tv. Globalization, deglobalization and the liberal international order. **International Affairs**, Oxford, p. 1–12, 2021.

MCGREW, Anthony. Power shift: from national government to global governance? In: HELD, David (Ed.). **A globalizing world? Culture, economic, politics**. London: Routledge, 2004. p. 123–160.

MELLO, Sergio Vieira. Cinco questões sobre direitos humanos. **Revista Internacional de Direitos Humanos**, São Paulo, 2004.

MONEY, Jeannette. Globalization, international mobility and the liberal international order. **International Affairs**, Oxford, p. 1–37, 2021.

NOORTMANN, Math. Non-state actors in International Law. In: ARTS, Bas; NOORTMANN, Math; REINALDA, Bob (Ed.). **Non-state actors in international relations**. Burlington: Ashgate, 2001.

PIERIK, Roland. Globalization and global governance: a conceptual analysis. In: HEERE, Wybo (Org.). **Government to governance: the growing impact of non-state actors on the international and European legal system**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

PIKETTY, Thomas. **O capital no século XXI**. Rio de Janeiro: Intrínseca, 2014.

RODRIK, Dani. **Has globalization gone too far?** Washington: Institute for National Economics, 1997.

SAID, Edward. **Humanismo e crítica democrática**. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2007.

SERRANO, Franklin; SUMMA, Ricardo. Aggregate demand and the slowdown of Brazilian economic growth in 2011–2014. **Nova Economia**, Belo Horizonte, v. 25, n. spe., p. 803–833, 2015.

SILVA, Adriana Moura Matos. **Política pública para migrantes no município de São Paulo: análise de ações de acolhida**. 2017. Dissertação (Mestrado em Gestão e Políticas Públicas) – Escola de Administração de Empresas de São Paulo, Fundação Getulio Vargas, São Paulo.

TENÓRIO, Fernando. A unidade dos contrários: fordismo e pós-fordismo. **Revista de Administração Pública – FGV**, Rio de Janeiro, v. 45, n. 4, p. 1141–1172, 2011.

UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT – UNCTAD. **The Russian crisis**. 2020. Available at: <https://unctad.org/system/files/official-document/poirrsd002.en.pdf>.

GABRIELA SOLDANO GARCEZ

Attorney, credentialed journalist, and educator. Holds a Master's in Environmental Law and a PhD in International Environmental Law (both funded by CAPES) from the Catholic University of Santos. Completed postdoctoral studies at the University of Santiago de Compostela (Spain) and at the University of Coimbra. Permanent faculty member of the Graduate Program (master's and doctoral levels) at Unisantos, in International Environmental Law. Finalist for the 2018 Jabuti Prize, in the "Essays" category, within the "Sciences" track. Deputy Coordinator of the "Human Rights and Vulnerabilities" Research Group at the Catholic University of Santos. Deputy Coordinator of the Sérgio Vieira de Mello Chair at the Catholic University of Santos.

Professional address: Campus Dom Idílio José Soares, 300 Conselheiro Nébias Avenue – Vila Mathias, Santos, Brazil.

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1343-8733>

EMAIL: gabrielasoldano@unisantos.br

ANGELA LIMONGI ALVARENGA ALVES

Habilitation (Livre-Docte, 2022), PhD (2017), and Postdoctoral Fellow (2017–2020) in Law from the University of São Paulo (USP, Brazil). Visiting Researcher (2018–2019) at the School of Government and International Affairs, Durham University, United Kingdom, and Researcher at the Global Policy Institute—both under the supervision of Prof. David Held (2018–2019). Permanent professor–researcher in the Stricto Sensu Graduate Program in Law (Master's and PhD) at the Catholic University of Santos (Unisantos, Brazil) since 2020.

Professional address: Campus Dom Idílio José Soares, 300 Conselheiro Nébias Avenue – Vila Mathias, Santos, Brazil.

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1765-4225>

EMAIL: angelalimongi@unisantos.br

Received: 11/12/2024

Accepted: 23/08/2025



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

LICENSE TO USE

Authors grant Sequência Journal exclusive rights of first publication, and the work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License. The license authorizes third parties to remix, adapt, and/or create from the published work, indicating credit to the original work and its initial publication. The authors are allowed to enter into additional separate agreements, with non-exclusive distribution of the version published in Sequência Journal, indicating, in any case, authorship and initial publication in this journal.