

1 • Citizen engagements in a globalizing world

JOHN GAVENTA AND RAJESH TANDON¹

Introduction

From Cancún to Copenhagen, from trade debates to climate debates and from financial crises to food crises, the impacts of global forces on everyday life are becoming increasingly apparent. With globalization have come changing forms of power and new realms of authority, and with these, new spaces for public action. From local to global, fields of power and landscapes of authority are being reconfigured, affecting the lives and futures of citizens across the planet, while simultaneously reshaping where and how citizens engage to make their voices heard. If we believe in the ideals of democracy, in which citizens have the right to participate in decisions and deliberations affecting their lives, what are the implications when these extend beyond traditionally understood national and local boundaries? If we are interested in the possibilities of citizen action to claim and ensure rights, and to bring about social change, how do citizens navigate this new, more complicated terrain? What are the consequences for an emerging sense and experience of global citizenship, and for holding governments and powerful supra-national institutions and authorities to account?

While a great deal of attention has been paid in the literature to these changing patterns of global governance, we know remarkably little about how they play out, or their consequences and implications for ordinary citizens. In this volume, this theme is explored through empirical research in Brazil, India, the Gambia, Nigeria, the Philippines and South Africa, as well as in cross-national projects in Latin America and Africa. The case studies focus on a number of sectors: the environment, trade, education, livelihoods, health and HIV/AIDS, work and occupational disease, agriculture and land.² They document different types of engagement, ranging from transnational campaigns and social movements to participation in new institutionally designed fora. Taking a citizen's perspective, they look upwards and outwards at shifting global forms of authority and ask whether, in response to these governance changes, citizens themselves are expressing new rights

claims on global duty holders, and whether they are expressing new forms of global solidarity with citizens in other localities.

There are a number of possible responses to these questions. On the one hand, some scholars have argued, globalization has led to changes in governance and emerging transnational social movements which are creating new spaces and opportunities for citizen engagement. In the process, as citizenship has become delinked from territorial boundaries, it has also become more multilayered and multi-scaled, while governance increasingly involves both state and non-state actors, many of which are transnational. The new global configuration, some optimistically argue, provides the conditions for the ascendancy of a new sense of global citizenship, which deepens and expands democratic participation and the realization of human rights.

The case studies in this volume, however, collectively present a somewhat more sombre picture. While shifting landscapes of global authority create new spaces and opportunities for citizen engagement, they also carry with them new possibilities for and forms of power, which interact with deeply embedded local practices. For some citizens, there are new opportunities for participation in transnational processes of action, resulting in the emergence of a new sense of global citizenship and solidarity. Yet for many other ordinary citizens, changes in global authority may have the opposite effect, strengthening the layers and discourses of power that limit the possibilities for their local action, and constraining – or, at least, not enabling – a sense of citizen agency. Even in these cases, however, one can see localized patterns of resistance to global forces, motivated by immediate issues of survival and fragility, rather than a virtuous sense of global solidarity and citizenship.

In the first section of this introductory chapter, we bring together empirical insights from the case studies on how changing global governance patterns affect the possibilities for and arenas of citizen engagement. Sometimes they create new spheres for engagement beyond the nation-state; at other times they bring global factors to bear on national and local forms of action. Contrary to some assertions made in the literature, we find that globalized governance does not necessarily imply a diminishing role for the nation-state. Rather, globalization adds new layers, arenas and jurisdictions of governance, often bringing contestation and competition across them rather than the replacing of one arena with another.

We move on to discuss ways that the multi-tiered and multipolar character of global authority simultaneously creates new multilayered and multidimensional identities of citizenship, which in some cases

create new possibilities for inclusive citizen voice, while in others serve to reinforce axes for greater exclusion, contributing to the weakening of already fragile forms of citizen expression. In sum, there are winners and losers in this process.

In the next section we argue that explaining the difference in these outcomes involves exploring forms of mobilization, the role of mediators and the politics of knowledge which shape the possibilities and practices of citizenship in response to the changes in the global landscape. By examining these intervening factors, we can gain insights into the paradox of why, for some, globalization offers possibilities for a new sense of solidarity and new opportunities for engagement, while for others it offers little real opportunity for expanded solidarity, and weakens the possibilities for citizen agency.

We end this chapter by arguing that taking a ‘vertical’ approach – one that looks at the *interrelationships* of levels of authority along a scale running from local to global – has important strategic implications for citizen action and social movements. In this interdependent world, more inclusive citizenship, and with it more effective forms of citizen engagement, will not be realized by a focus on one arena or layer of political authority alone. Rather, more promise is found in new forms of engagement which recognize the layers of authority and employ strategies that build citizen solidarity vertically and synergistically across them.

The changing nature of governance: new spaces for citizen engagements?

It is now commonplace in emerging literature on globalization and governance to argue that authority is moving beyond singular nation-state systems and power is increasingly dispersed along a scale from local to global, and across state and non-state actors. In this new emerging global order, governance is seen as a) multilayered (cutting across global, regional, national and local institutions), b) polyarchic or pluralistic (in the sense that no site of governance has unilateral, supreme and absolute authority), c) geometrically varied (in that regulatory systems vary across issues and geographies), and d) structurally complex (made up of diverse state and non-state agencies and networks) (Held and McGrew 2002: 9). Such shifts in global governance have important consequences for grassroots actors. They reshape the possibilities for extending their action to the international arena, as well as for citizen action more locally (Della Porta and Tarrow 2005; Edwards and Gaventa 2001; Keck and Sikkink 1998; Appadurai 2000).³

In every case in this volume, we see examples of how this shifting

political authority affects where and how citizens engage on a range of issues including education, HIV, occupational health, environment, land, agriculture, livelihood, trade and 'forced' displacement. While much of the literature on the consequences of global governance focuses on the emergence of *transnational* citizen action, our first group of chapters present a number of examples of how new global actors and factors are brought to bear on *national and local* decision-making processes. In Chapter 2, Cassidy and Leach outline how changing patterns of power and governance are unfolding in relation to HIV/AIDS in the small West African country of the Gambia. Here, a new globalism in public health has led to an array of international initiatives and funding mechanisms contributing to a shift from authority based on the nation-state towards global public-private-philanthropic partnerships. We see how powerful global funding mechanisms – such as the Global Fund, the US President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief, and the World Bank's Multi-Country AIDS Programme – affect the decision-making and dynamics of citizen engagement at the national and local level, with little or no downwards accountability to the people affected. Continuing in the field of global health, in Chapter 3 Robins investigates how global funding in South Africa is mediated downwards through international NGOs and local health activists, and with it the extension of global ideas, discourses and technologies that affect patterns of local action and resistance.

In Chapter 4, we shift from Africa to India, and from health to the arena of livelihoods. In this chapter, Julie Thekkudan focuses on Project Shakti, an initiative promoted by the Indian government in collaboration with Unilever, a multinational corporation, to fund women's self-help groups at the grassroots level. This initiative represented a new public-private partnership arrangement, but with little accountability downwards, despite great consequences for local identities and the actions of local participants. Moving to agricultural livelihoods, in Chapter 5 Ian Scoones examines the dynamics of engagement in new global fora, in this case the International Assessment of Agricultural Knowledge, Science and Technology for Development (IAASTD), an ambitious attempt to encourage local and global debate on the future of agricultural science and technology through 'cross-stakeholder dialogue'. Responding to critiques of top-down, Northern-dominated expert assessments of the past, the IAASTD aimed to be more inclusive and participatory in both design and process, in a way that became inevitably 'fraught and flawed'.

In the next section of the book, we move from cases that examine the impact of global actors on everyday citizenship to those which explore the dynamics of transnational action as citizens attempt to mobilize

upwards from their local spaces to put pressure on global decision-makers. In so doing, these case studies also reveal, they must deal with an increasing complexity of levels and types of authorities.

In Chapter 6, Borras and Franco focus on the case of *Vía Campesina*, one of the largest transnational agrarian movements, examining how rural agrarian movements have responded to the growing forces of globalization, especially in relation to land rights. Drawing on Fox (2001), the authors describe how nation-states have been affected by a ‘triple squeeze’: ‘from above’ through the growing regulatory power of international institutions; ‘from below’ through the decentralization of some authority to local actors; and the ‘from the sides’ through the ceding of some functions to private or quasi-public actors. As a result, the peasant movement has begun to focus much more on international institutions as duty bearers that must be accountable for upholding local land rights.

The diffusion of authority across layers and actors is also found in Chapter 7, which examines the Global Campaign for Education (GCE). Gaventa and Mayo outline how the global right to education is now affected by a multiplicity of players at different levels. As a result, they argue, citizen action must span a variety of new spaces in order to reach the universal goal of education for all. In Chapter 8, Icaza et al. illustrate how shifting patterns of trade governance, as seen in the North American Free Trade Agreement and other similar accords, create new rights for private actors, which affect where and how citizens can exercise their voice. From traditionally holding their own state to account for the provision of basic services and the fulfilment of social and economic rights, citizens must now engage private actors and defend their rights in the regional and international arenas where key decisions are increasingly made.

In Chapter 9, Waldman describes how the area of occupational health is governed increasingly by a dizzying array of global regulatory actors that exercise an array of hard and soft regulatory powers, and the consequent effects on citizen mobilization on asbestos disease in South Africa and India. In Chapter 10, Alonso shows how challenges of linking from the local to the global on environmental issues in Brazil create new types of ‘hybrid activists’, with new sets of skills required for effective engagement. In Chapter 11, Mehta and Napier-Moore describe how even displaced people – who are in some cases effectively stateless and do not have access to full citizenship rights in their host countries – in fact find themselves regulated and governed by an array of international frameworks and agencies.

Thus each of the chapters in this book illustrates a concrete example of how the shifting landscapes of global authority affect the possible

terrain of spaces in which citizens may engage. In each of the important policy issues illustrated, the responsible actors and authorities are found not only at the national and local levels. Such new governance regimes are driven by a number of factors, many of which are associated with global economic forces. In India, increased engagement with global market actors reshapes public and private contours of power at the national and local level, while in the Philippines and elsewhere a growing international land grab affects the traditional structures that regulate land reform. In other cases new quasi-public entities such as the Global Fund or large environmental foundations – what Edwards (2008) calls the philanthrocapitalists – play an increasing role in the governance of social policies across a range of sectors. In some cases, these actors exercise power through formal authority. More often than not, however, they illustrate the ‘soft powers’ that characterize global authority (Nye 2004; Lukes 2007), through their effect on knowledge and discourses, or through the creation of cross-cutting networks of actors, which link public and private, governmental and non-governmental, in visible or sometimes less visible ways.

In all of these changes, the nation-state increasingly becomes squeezed between the rights and needs of its citizens, and the demands and expectations of global forces and actors, many of whom are non-state or international actors who bring a different set of pressures and accountabilities (Scholte 2005). While some scholars argue that the growth of global governance effectively diminishes the role of the nation-state (Rosenau 2002), these cases suggest in fact that the capacity of the nation-state to mediate between the local and the global is critical to how global pressures enhance or weaken the rights and claims of local citizens. From a citizen’s perspective, the internationalization of authority means negotiating additional layers of governance, characterized by increasing complexity and opaqueness, in which the local, national and global constantly mingle. Mobilization for rights and accountability, if it is to be effective, must look beyond the national and the local to the global arena, as well as to interactions across the entire spectrum of governance. Movements themselves, as we shall explore later, are faced with the challenge of becoming multi-scalar, as well as becoming able to deal with a wide variety of actors and authorities.

The implications of changing authorities for the meanings and practices of citizenship

To raise the question of the impact of global governance on citizen action is to immediately enter into voluminous and enduring debates

on the possibilities of ‘global’, ‘world’ or ‘cosmopolitan’ citizenship. While there is much debate on the meanings of these terms,⁴ at its most basic level the concept of global or cosmopolitan citizenship challenges the conventional meaning of citizenship as exclusive membership and participation within a territorially bounded political community. The notion is not necessarily new: it has existed in political thought since early Greek thinking on citizenship, and as such even pre-dates notions of citizenship linked to the nation (Schattle 2008). Since the 1980s, however, in the face of globalization and the associated transnationalization of markets, communications and civil society, the term ‘global citizenship’ has become increasingly common in public and academic discourse, while views on its normative importance and practical possibilities remain deeply divided.

On the one hand, there are those who argue normatively that the expansion of global citizenship is critical in today’s world. It is a path for promoting global democracy (Archibugi 2008; Held 1995) and overcoming global governance deficits (Scholte 2002), for ensuring ecological sustainability (van Steenberg 1994) and for realizing universal human values (Falk 1993; Heater 2002). Shifts in global authority, the arguments go, require the possibility of new practices of global citizen action (Edwards and Gaventa 2001), a democratizing and regulatory role for global civil society (Scholte 2008; MacKenzie 2009), the extension of global rights frameworks through citizen engagement and social movements (McKeon 2009; Stammers 2009), the development of new forms of global accountability (Ebrahim and Weisband 2007) and new identities and possibilities of global citizenship (Schattle 2008). ‘Global citizenship, in the present day,’ Schattle argues, ‘is rich, complex and tangible. In this new millennium, global citizenship has become much more than an abstract ideal espoused mainly by philosophers and visionaries. Now, more than ever, the practices of global citizenship are upon us’ (ibid.: 6).

On the other hand, sceptics argue, such notions of global citizenship are at best an aspiration and at worst ill founded. As Heater argues, ‘the essence of citizenship is the individual’s relation to the state. Yet there is no *world state*’ (2002: 6); therefore there are few prospects of meaningful forms of global citizenship. To argue for such, some suggest, is to risk weakening and undermining the legitimacy of existing nation-states and the frameworks of human rights implemented through them. Moreover, others propose, meaningful participation and deliberations can only best occur at the smaller-scale, community level (Schattle 2008). Others argue that while the aspiration of a global identity or community of citizens is admirable, it is deeply contradicted by rising national and

ethnic allegiances (Heater 2002). Even where transnational identities and communities are emerging, Fox argues, these 'involve boundaries, rights and responsibilities that are too amorphous to warrant the term citizenship, especially when ideas such as membership, standing or human rights will do' (Fox 2005: 194).

While the views are highly divided, the position one takes within them often turns on two other definitional issues. First, those who take a sceptical view often define citizenship in relation to states, to the exclusion of other widely recognized understandings which recognize that citizenship identities are more complex and multidimensional than those which are simply state-conferred. These broader concepts include seeing citizenship in terms of solidarity and belonging to a broader community (Ellison 1997), and seeing one's rights and duties in relationship to non-state institutions and actors as well as states (e.g. corporations) (Hoffman 2004; Mohanty and Tandon 2006). At the international level, this broader, more multidimensional view arguably increases in importance, and exists side by side with the statist view. As Schattle (2008: 3-4) observes, 'the legal institution of national citizenship might well remain firmly in the hands of nation-states, and nation-states might well remain a principal but not exclusive basis of political membership and allegiance, but these realities no longer keep global citizenship from flourishing in other ways. Like it or not, individuals all over the world are choosing to think of themselves as global citizens and to shape their lives as members and participants in communities reaching out to all humanity.'

Second, differences in views on global citizenship often hinge on whether one is defining the status quo, or whether one is defining an emergent notion – in Falk's view, whether one is looking at the 'axis of feasibility' or the 'axis of aspiration' (1994: 140). He goes on to argue that 'global citizenship in its idealistic and aspirational expression, if mechanically superimposed on the present reality of geopolitics, is a purely sentimental, and slightly absurd notion. In contrast, if global citizenship is conceived to be a political project, associated with the possibility of a future political community of global or species scope, then it assumes, it seems to me, a far more constitutive and challenging political character' (ibid.: 139). From this latter perspective, citizenship can be understood as an emergent and historically evolving concept, rather than something which is fixed at a given point in time.

While both intense and voluminous, these debates on the possibilities of global citizenship remain normative and theoretical in nature. Very few studies have looked empirically at how citizens themselves

actually engage with and respond to the changing landscapes of global authority, and what this means for their own understandings and practices of citizenship. Those that have done so have focused more on global citizenship identities through personal narratives⁵ than on what these mean for collective citizen action. The case studies in this volume, therefore, give us a unique insight into how citizens at the grassroots level actually experience changes in global authority, and what in turn that implies for the meanings of citizenship and the possibilities of global citizen action.

Consistent with other volumes in this *Claiming Citizenship* series, these cases take a citizens' perspective (Eyben and Ladbury 2006), looking upwards and outwards at how citizens see and experience global institutions, rather than the other way around. In such an approach, we understand citizenship through the lens of how it is understood and practised, rather than whether it is legally or institutionally ascribed. Such an actor-oriented approach (Nyamu-Musembi 2005) also puts more emphasis on how citizens perceive their own agency, and whom they hold accountable for their rights, than on whether global institutions and legal frameworks that can uphold such rights already exist.⁶ In other words, we are interested in whether and how the shifting nature of political authority in global governance has creating lived experiences of citizenship which have a transnational, trans-state character, even if these are yet to be acknowledged explicitly by such political authorities in global governance. By focusing on whether there is an emergent sense of global citizenship, we also take a historical view of citizenship as being under construction over time, through social movements and social action, not only 'given' from above through more elite reforms.⁷

In taking such a view, we agree with the approach of Heater, which suggests that citizenship operates both 'vertically' and 'horizontally'. As he puts it, 'the world citizen needs to relate in that capacity both to global institutions and to human world community [...] For example, a world citizen may wish to concentrate on campaigning for reform of the UN or on supporting organisations devoted to relieving world poverty' (2002: 5).

The vertical view has to do with the perceived relationships of citizens to the state, and potentially to other authorities. Historically, this is the most prevalent view at the national level. Rights are conferred to citizens by the state, through constitutions, laws and policies, and, in turn, citizens can claim these rights and accountability from the concerned state agencies, which are duty bound to respond. Transposing this pattern of conferring, claiming and responding to the international

arena, we can ask how the changing configurations of global authority affect the spaces in which citizens can claim their rights and their perceptions of duty holders. We argue that if citizens have a subjective sense of rights vis-à-vis global duty holders, this may be evidence of an emerging sense of global citizenship.

The second dimension, the horizontal view, has to do with how citizens perceive themselves as part of a broader global community. In earlier studies in this series, as well as in the broader literature on citizenship, this has also been found to be an important dimension of shifting patterns of authority. As Kabeer (2005) found in her volume on *Inclusive Citizenship*, which focused on the meanings of citizenship at local and national levels, ‘what emerges from these narratives is what might be called a “horizontal” view of citizenship, one which stresses that the relationship between citizens is at least as important as the more traditional “vertical” view of citizenship as the relationship between the state and the individual’ (ibid.: 23). How, then, we may ask, is such a meaning of citizenship played out across borders? Is there a sense of solidarity with others? Does this horizontal solidarity contribute to strengthened citizen action, whether locally or globally?

Using the vertical and horizontal views of citizenship, we explore what these chapters say about the possibilities for an emergent global citizenship offered by the new configuration of global authorities. Our empirical interrogation leads us to somewhat contradictory conclusions, suggesting that global governance is Janus-faced, simultaneously opening and constraining new meanings and practices of citizenship.

Our first question is whether and how shifting global authority has opened up new perceptions and possibilities for citizens to claim rights and accountability from those institutions perceived to be responsible for them. On the one hand, we see a number of examples where this has been the case. In the example of *Vía Campesina*, for instance, Borras and Franco show how the movement has reframed land rights as citizenship rights, projecting themselves as ‘rights holders’ and targeting global institutions as ‘duty bearers’ that must be held accountable. In so doing *Vía Campesina* has advocated, created and occupied a ‘new citizenship space’ that did not exist before at the global governance level – a distinct space for poor peasants and small farmers. Similarly, Gaventa and Mayo show that the international ‘Education for All’ campaign is seen as a relatively successful example of how to negotiate a multilayered terrain in order to put pressure on international authorities to realize the right to education. Icaza et al. explore how changing patterns of trade governance affect the meanings and practices of citizenship in the

Americas, finding new solidarities and expressions of citizenship being articulated ‘from below’ in defence of rights and livelihoods. These are voiced, in multiple governance arenas, to a range of duty holders, including governments, regional and intergovernmental organizations and multinational corporations. By contrast, Mehta and Napier-Moore demonstrate how displaced people exercise their agency and participate in protest and mobilization vis-à-vis perceived duty holders, despite their stateless status. In so doing so, they challenge conventional understandings of citizenship in relation to the nation-state and make the need for new concepts of global citizenship even more compelling.

Other chapters, however, show cases where the emergence of global actors and forces did not necessarily open up new possibilities for engagement, and arguably in some cases even weakened the terrains for action at the national and local levels. In the Gambia and South Africa, global donors have become dominant players on the HIV/AIDS agenda, on the one hand bringing funding, but on the other adding a new layer of governance to already fragile states and communities. Asking whether the new global configurations offer the possibilities for those living with HIV in the Gambia to express new forms of citizenship, Cassidy and Leach write, ‘for people so extremely poor and vulnerable, in these power effects such global initiatives sweep them up into a vortex of discourse and procedure that may look like local–global citizen engagement but are perhaps better cast as subjection to (global) governmentality’ (this volume: page 51). Similarly, Robins illustrates how global health programmes, and their local NGO and social movement mediators in South Africa, often encounter considerable ‘friction’ not only from powerful national state actors, who may view such programmes as challenges to national sovereignty, but also from the most marginalized village-level actors, who may resist globalizing discourses on health in complex and yet often hidden ways.

Another example is provided by the IAASTD process described by Scoones. While IAASTD was designed to open up more inclusive and participatory spaces in global dialogues on the future of agriculture, Scoones questions the extent to which it was able to do so, and notes the absence of the voices of local farmers – those most directly affected – in the process.

In each of these cases, then, while global spaces for engagement were in theory opened up to citizen action from below, in fact other global actors also stepped into these spaces, often driven by other interests, and affecting and constraining the possibilities for local action. On the one hand, these spaces create new possibilities and identities for

rights-claiming from below; yet on the other, they can add new levels of power and discourse, which are difficult for local citizens and even nation-states to transcend.

The degree to which the new spaces offer opportunities to exercise citizenship through claiming rights or accountability 'vertically' from global institutions affects and is affected in turn by new horizontal identities and solidarities, and whether they help to strengthen citizen action and claims from below. Here again the cases provide us with mixed, somewhat contradictory evidence.

On the one hand, in the examples of the transnational movements on land, education and trade, we gain a sense of strong horizontal connections among those facing common issues across borders. Territorial boundaries were overcome by the strength of mobilizations created around the shared identities of peasants, poor parents or fellow activists. In the case of the GCE, in particular, the construction of a Global Week of Action created a new space for concerted simultaneous action on education in localities around the globe. With this came an empowering sense of connection with others, one which extended rather than replaced a sense of national citizenship.

By contrast, the women members of Unilever-sponsored self-help groups in India, the grassroots asbestos factory workers in Gujarat and people living with HIV/AIDS in the Gambia and South Africa were unable to access or demand their rights in the global sphere, and as a result, trans-border solidarities were not developed or mobilized. In the Indian case local women's self-help groups become partners with Unilever, a large multinational company, in a project aimed at linking them to the global economy and contributing to their economic empowerment as *Shakti Amma* (empowerment mothers). In reality, however, the integration of the self-help groups into the global value chain through the sale of soap, detergents and cosmetics gradually affected the identities of the rural women involved, who instead of 'empowerment mothers' came to be seen as 'beauty agents'. Identities of cleanliness and Western beauty, the chapter argues, helped to undermine the strength and potential of the self-help groups that were meant to be transformed. In all of these cases, in the absence of horizontal solidarity networks, global duty bearers were subtly able to deflect their obligations towards others.

Across these cases, looking both vertically and horizontally, we gain a paradoxical view of the possibilities that changing global landscapes offer citizen action. By way of summary, the contrasts are perhaps most clearly illustrated in Chapter 9, in which Waldman gives two very different pictures of struggles over asbestos-related diseases in South Africa

and India. In South Africa, a global campaign was grounded in the grass roots and supported by the South African state, not only leading to successful claims, but also shaping a new sense of empowered citizenship at the local level. In India, by contrast, a more professional campaign, facing the hostility of the Indian state, was able to mobilize globally, but with little impact either on national policies or on the sense of global solidarity of the asbestos workers affected. In fact, the chapter argues, the Indian workers became more distant from the discourses and debates that affected them.

For scholars of citizenship, these results are perhaps unsurprising. Historically, the concept of citizenship has always been about both inclusion and exclusion (Kabeer 2005; Yashar 2005). To define and enrol some as citizens has often meant shaping boundaries that exclude others, be they migrants, youth, the illiterate, indigenous peoples, sexual minorities or other groups that are marginalized at particular historical moments. Struggles over citizenship have always been not only about the progressive expansion of rights and identities, but also about counterpressures or trends which serve to limit the rights and identities of others. This is perhaps most clearly seen today in the simultaneous trends of emergent interests in global citizenship, alongside the increased backlash and restrictions affecting global migrants.

Navigating the global terrain

In the previous section, we gave some examples of how changing patterns of global authority had very different effects on citizenship identities and practices, offering the possibilities of a strengthened sense of inclusive citizenship for some, while serving to create new forms of exclusion for others. How can we explain these differences? While we cannot make causal assertions, in discussions and analysis of the case studies among the authors⁸ three important factors emerged: the politics of mobilization, the politics of intermediation, and the politics of knowledge. It is these intervening factors – which sit between citizens and global authorities – to which we now turn.

The politics of mobilization As we have argued throughout this chapter, changing patterns of globalization create new opportunities for both inclusion and exclusion, across increasingly complex multi-tiered and multi-scalar forms of governance. What are the implications of this complexity for the politics of mobilization, and for the strategies and tactics that are used for collective citizen action?

For Tarrow, the new internationalization opens the possibility of

‘scale shift’: ‘an essential element of all contentious politics, without which all contention that arises locally would remain at that level. Such a shift can operate in two directions: *upward*, in which case local action spreads outwards from its origins; or *downward*, when a generalized practice is adopted at a lower level’ (2005: 121).⁹ Navigating the international system can be particularly challenging for activists because it both ‘opens conduits for upward shift and can empower national, regional and local contention with international models of collective action. But by the same token, as new forms of contention move downward, their original meanings may diffuse and the forms of organization they produce may domesticate’ (ibid.: 121).

Certainly, in our cases we see examples of both upward and downward scale shifts. Upward shifts are illustrated by the global campaigns on agrarian reform, education rights, trade and occupational health, where we see examples of well-built transnational advocacy networks, largely arising from and involving actions from below. As well as these, we see examples of where the origins of scalar shift are located ‘above’, and involve the intervention of new actors or discourses, such as the Global Fund in the Gambia and NGO mediators in South African AIDS politics; or the creation of the IAASTD as a global forum; or in Unilever’s intervention into local women’s self-help groups. What is also clear, but has been less explored by Tarrow and other analysts, is that the origin of the scalar shift – whether from ‘below’ or ‘above’ – has an effect on the dynamics of the mobilization and action which consequently occur.

This is illustrated, for instance, in the two contrasting cases of Brazilian environmental activism examined by Alonso. Borrowing a concept from Tilly, she argues that in the case of SOS Rainforest, in moving from global to local one sees a politics of ‘emulation’ or local reproduction of global modes of operation. By contrast, in the case of the Instituto Socioambiental, a local Brazilian organization which moved from local campaigns to global ones, one sees a politics of ‘adaptation’, in which mobilization adapted to new realities.

Though perhaps not as neatly as in the Brazil example, other cases illustrate ways in which the direction of the scalar shift had a dramatic effect on the types of mobilization strategies that were available. In those cases originating from below and seeking international attention, campaigners sought to gain public recognition of their grievances, using a wide variety of tactics. Sometimes, as in the cases of the agrarian movements and trade movements, they mobilized in ‘invited’ or formal consultative arenas, usually organized ‘from above’ by regional or international bodies. Yet such engagements, the cases remind us,

risk legitimizing the very global structures the movements sought to challenge, so they were often also supplemented by strategies to create new public spaces – globally, nationally and locally – that could give visibility to their demands. For the GCE, the 2008 Global Week of Action was one such space, in which 7.5 million activists participated simultaneously in actions in 120 countries. For the trade campaigns, popular plebiscites created similar spaces for mobilization: in Paraguay, a citizen-organized consultation in 2003 led to the participation of over 160,000 people, putting the issue on the national agenda. Borrás and Franco note that the *Vía Campesina* campaign used a combination of mobilization tactics, from ‘protests in international venues, participation in some official conferences, and non-participation in others, combined with continuing land-related actions “from below” in national and local settings’ (this volume: page 123), while for the South African anti-asbestos campaigners, a combination of grassroots action, national lobbying and international legal challenges was used. In all of these cases, though the focus was on bringing grassroots challenges upwards to global attention, mobilization continued to involve multiple, simultaneous strategies across levels.

When the scalar shift moves in the other direction – when global actors or institutions attempt to enlist the engagement of the grass roots, or construct their identities from above in such a way as to provoke local resistance – we see another type of engagement. In the case of the interventions from above by the Global Fund in the Gambia, the injection of large pools of funds and resources created a perverse dynamic, in which engagement in the global project was not necessarily a sign of collective mobilization for citizenship rights, but primarily a form of accessing and competing for material resources. In South Africa, reliance on local cultural and religious beliefs in Pondoland, part of the rural periphery, is cast by Robins as a way in which citizens contest or circumvent ‘globalizing and biomedicalizing’ governance initiatives. In both cases, the planned interventions from above to enrol citizens into forms of global-local engagement prompted unforeseen responses, in which even the very poor resisted, ignored or adapted global initiatives to their own ends rather than mobilize publicly upon them.

In the case of displaced peoples, even those without formal citizenship rights in their host states still found ways to mobilize – sometimes by acquisition of rights through informal means, sometimes by quiet subversion and resistance to identities ascribed to them by their refugee status, and at other times by highly visible symbolic protest. In Egypt, while Sudanese refugees could not take their protest to the global stage,

they could protest in front of the local offices of the UNHCR, giving visibility to their claims. In the UK, an asylum seeker sewed his eyes, ears and lips closed, dramatically symbolizing the failures to be seen or heard, and in so doing gained international media coverage as well as the attention of national and global authorities.

The point of all of these examples is that global citizen engagement may take place in a number of ways. In some of the better-known cases, now well documented in the literature on global citizen action, it occurs through transnational action. But in other cases, it occurs through local, rather than transnational, forms of resistance to global forces and actors as they are manifested within the locality. Citizen action in response to global forces can be *on* the global *in* the local, as well as *from* the local *to* the global – though the tactics and strategies of each may vary.

But if, as we saw in the previous section, governance and authority are multilayered, then one would expect that the most effective forms of citizen engagement would be those that are able to mobilize across all levels simultaneously. In some of our cases, we catch glimpses of how this can occur. In the case of the GCE, for instance, deliberate attempts were made to construct linked action across multiple ‘citizenship spaces’. But other cases illustrate the complexities of doing this. In the Indian anti-asbestos campaign, as national-level professional campaigners moved to build global pressure, they lost their roots and connection to the local. The capacity and ability of movements to navigate this local–global terrain depends therefore on two other very important factors – the nature of the intermediation between the local and the global, and the politics of knowledge that affects the framing and legitimacy of key issues and actors across levels.

The politics of intermediation If mobilization increasingly moves from the local to the global, and vice versa, a factor of growing importance is the nature of the mediation across and between actors and authorities at different levels. As most mobilizing groups are not able to speak directly to power in their own locale, the politics of representation, of who speaks for whom, and of accountability, becomes more important. And without effective mediating mechanisms which link the scales and arenas of engagement, various writers argue, transnational forms of action risk floating ‘free in a global ether’ (Florini 2000: 217), unaccountable and disconnected from the grass roots (Batliwala 2002).

In our case studies, it becomes clear that the nature and quality of mediation across levels or scales of power and action are critical for determining the nature and quality of the impact which emerges. As is

best illustrated by the case study of environmental movements in Brazil, ‘hybrid activism’ – the ability to maintain a local identity and connection simultaneously – can have a big impact on the success of mobilization. By direct contrast, in the Indian case, it was the absence of effective mediation which was a key factor in a programme aimed at creating women’s empowerment, but which resulted instead in ‘the making of “vulnerable salesgirls” unable to empower themselves’ (Thekkudan, this volume: page 92). In the Gambia, a new ‘nexus of governmental and non-governmental institutions’ became an important mediator between the Global Fund and people living with HIV and AIDS, while in the case of the Vía Campesina, the struggle was to bypass mediation by government and NGO agencies, and for peasants to have more direct representation in the global arenas themselves.

Who are these mediators? In these cases, they range enormously, from individuals to NGOs and social movements to the state itself. In many cases, mediators emerge as highly skilled individuals who are able to move across spaces of engagement and interpret between actors. At the international level, Tarrow describes these individuals as ‘rooted cosmopolitans’ or ‘transnational activists’ (2005: 29). In her work on the biographies of two environmental leaders in Brazil, Alonso prefers to use the term ‘hybrid citizens’: those who maintain deep rootedness to the local, even while moving within and across global arenas. Hybrid citizens are constantly juggling to maintain multiple identities, sometimes more successfully than others. In the IAASTD process, for instance, Scoones discusses the role played by ‘international experts’ who also held other identities – based on gender, regional origin, family background – which affected how they were seen and how they spoke. In the anti-asbestos campaigns in South Africa, the local–global links were mediated by professional doctors and human rights specialists who were able to link to the international while remaining rooted in South Africa; in India, Delhi-based professionals who were drawn into international science and regulatory circles were less able to maintain their local connections. In the HIV/AIDS case in South Africa, Robins describes the representatives of international NGOs, as well as local AIDS activists and practitioners, as the ‘brokers of biomedicine’ who encountered perhaps unexpected contestation from those living with HIV/AIDS themselves. In the Gambia, some local actors found that the ability to sit in user, NGO and state committees, and to be able to speak ‘the language of funders and intermediary NGOs’, was ‘the key to having productive engagements with them’, be those the per diems they received, or other in-kind benefits.

In other cases, the hybrid activism and the politics of intermediation were reflected more at the group or organizational level than through individuals. In the Gambia, for instance, local-level treatment support groups and national-level NGOs became critical new intermediary actors between the Global Fund and those living with HIV/AIDS. In other examples, such as Brazil, India and South Africa, the role of national-level civil society actors proves critical, yet still illustrates the challenges of remaining connected to local constituencies while simultaneously trying to influence global actors. In the case of the GCE, strong and pre-existing national campaigns, some of which received direct support from dedicated international sources, became a key building block and connector between global and local actors.

Both individual and organizational mediators, in turn, become critical in linking the local to the international effectively. Even when movements and campaigns occur only at one level – for example, within a local community – there are always questions of legitimacy, representation and accountability which arise about who speaks for whom and with what authority.¹⁰ When mobilizations attempt to link across levels, these questions become even more important. In the case of IAASTD, international civil society representatives were placed in the powerful and very responsible position of speaking *for* farmers whose lives would be affected by the agricultural policies being discussed, but there was little direct consultation *with* the farmers themselves. Many chose to deal with this pragmatically – to try to enter the space, despite their problematic position, to push the agendas to which they held strongly, perhaps deeply rooted in earlier experiences, but all done on behalf of others. On the other hand, in the case of the transnational agrarian movements, *Vía Campesina* challenged the legitimacy of the NGOs and the International Federation of Agricultural Producers which had traditionally represented peasant voices in global fora, and advocated a distinct space where peasants and small farmers could speak for themselves. In the case of the GCE, an attempt was made to overcome some of the hierarchies and sense of exclusion of local voices which have beset many other NGO-led international campaigns. In this case, Gaventa and Mayo argue, five factors were important for mediating between the local and the global through a single campaign movement. These included: a) strong pre-existing organizations at the base; b) inclusive and representative organizational structures; c) collective and intentional framing of the issues to link local and global concerns; d) recognitions of and sensitivity to the importance of the different roles of actors in each arena; and e) attention to the material

base of the campaign, so that international and national NGOs were not competing for the same funding.

While much of the literature, as well as examples in this book, shed light on the importance and identities of civil-society-based mediators in local-global citizen engagements, the state also emerges as a critical actor in shaping the politics and outcomes of intermediation. This is perhaps most clearly seen in the comparative study of the anti-asbestos campaigns in South Africa and India. While both have democratic states, the South African state supported the anti-asbestos stance of the citizens' movement, and promoted its engagement in international arenas. In India, on the other hand, the state tended to ally with the asbestos industry, and to put in place processes that discredited or weakened activist voices. In land struggles in the Philippines, despite the neo-liberal pressures for the state to leave land issues to the market, it has continued to play a strong mediating role. What emerges, then, is that the role of the nation-state, rather than being weakened in local-global citizen engagement, remains critical, not only in state-to-state relations, but in how it allies with and supports civil society in dealing – or failing to deal – with global market or other forces.

While we thus see multiple types of mediators – hybrid individuals, organizations, international networks and movements, even states – the nature of mediation is also affected by the origins of the mobilization. In more 'global-local' mobilizations, mediators were often experts, professionals and international NGOs, as seen primarily in Part Two of this volume. In more 'local-global' movements, illustrated in Part Three, the mediators were more likely to be 'hybrid activists', deeply rooted in the local identities and associations. In turn, where there are effective mediators – be they individuals, organizations or states – who remain deeply rooted and connected to local citizens, there appears to be a stronger likelihood of effective rights-claiming strategies and a sense of empowered citizenship emerging among movement participants. Where mediation is weak, claims may falter, and the 'global' may become an arena for greater exclusion, rather than giving rise to any new sense of global citizenship or solidarity.

The politics of knowledge Just as the origins of the mobilization affect the nature of mediation within it, so too does the mediation itself depend a great deal on the ability to navigate the politics of knowledge effectively. The role of knowledge in shaping and challenging power has long been considered in relation to citizen action at the local level (Tandon 1981; Leach and Scoones 2006). When we move to the global

arenas, many argue, the politics of knowledge becomes even more important. In the absence of the clear and widely accepted authority of global governance institutions, the production of and deliberations over knowledge become a critical path to establishing legitimacy (Adler and Bernstein 2005; Miller 2007) and regimes increasingly based on soft power and knowledge networks become more important (Nye 2004; Lukes 2007). As Miller puts it, there is therefore a need to give further attention ‘to *knowledge-making* as well as *decision-making* processes’ of international institutions’ (Miller 2007: 327, emphasis added).

For Miller, there are three important mechanisms through which international institutions ‘contribute to the epistemic ordering of world affairs’ (ibid.: 328), each of which is seen in the cases in this book. The first mechanism involves setting international knowledge standards and rules for monitoring and regulating global issues, as seen in these cases, for instance, in the role that asbestos standards played in shaping debates on occupational disease, or on educational standards in monitoring national level educational performance. A second mechanism has to do with ‘making global kinds, that is by bringing into being new ontological frameworks, classifications, and mappings that frame the conceptual underpinnings of global deliberation’ (ibid.: 328). The ways in which global biomedical knowledge is used to frame debates on HIV/AIDS in the Gambia and South Africa, or the numerous ways of labelling and classifying categories of ‘displacement’, are examples of this phenomenon. The third mechanism involves constructing new deliberative spaces, in which claims to knowledge and expertise become increasingly important, as seen, for instance, in the global deliberative experiment of the IAASTD. While recognizing the risks that their potential will not be realized, Miller argues for the relatively optimistic possibility that together the new global knowledge institutions ‘signal the struggle to deploy scientific knowledge and expertise as the basis for a global civic epistemology [that will emerge] out of deliberation rather than exclusion’ (ibid.: 350).

While affirming the importance of the global knowledge mechanisms, the cases in this volume suggest restraint on such an optimistic view for a number of reasons. First, as a number of cases suggest, rather than constraining global power, such knowledge mechanisms and institutions can themselves become new arenas for the exercise and contestation of power. As Scoones warns in the case of the IAASTD, the desire to create a universally deliberative space, driven by science and reason, can in fact serve to disguise the power differences and diversities that exist within the process itself. As he points out, ‘there is an interesting

contradiction in the simultaneous talk of engagement and involvement of diverse, multi-stakeholder perspectives and its confrontation with the ideal of consensus and an appeal to a universalized objectivity of science and expertise: the ultimate global vision' (this volume, page 105). Where these tensions are not addressed, then underlying issues of power may also remain unresolved.

Second, these cases suggest that knowledge legitimacy cannot be constructed through deliberation at the global level alone. Rather, it involves interaction with the local as well, which often brings into competition opposing framings and discourses between claims to universal 'truths' and locally understood realities. Within such interactions, write Jasanoff and Martello, what is particularly of interest is 'the reassertion of local knowledge claims and local identities against the simplifying and universalising forces of global science, technology and capital' (2004: 4). In this volume, the Gambia and South African cases on HIV/AIDS powerfully illustrate how global biomedical discourses are met with deep suspicion by differently situated actors, who draw on plural forms of knowing and interpreting their illness, resulting, as Robins observes, 'in complex citizen responses and contested forms of knowledge politics' (this volume: page 76).

In an era of 'soft' power, with often loose accountabilities, the ability to gain political legitimacy depends in turn on whose knowledge is seen as most legitimate and how an issue is framed. Mobilization not only involves action, but also knowledge (Keck and Sikkink 1998), particularly persuading or enrolling others within a particular knowledge frame. How issues are framed, and around whose views, often depends on the source of mobilizations and direction of travel. To establish broad framing and gain broad acceptance 'from above', knowledge is often presented as 'neutral', as objective science (as in the case of asbestos) or as growing from deliberative multi-stakeholder consultations (as in the cases of trade and agriculture). As the cases show, however, both the science and the deliberations are shaped themselves by powerful special interests or particular world-views. To establish framing 'from below', much emphasis is on the importance of local voices and on knowledge based on indigenous experiences. We see this in struggles over land rights, where the peasant movement documented and mobilized its own knowledge to challenge the homogenizing discourses and definitions of the problem organized by the World Bank. As Borrás and Franco remind us, who produces knowledge is not inconsequential to the world-view and perspective which it represents.

In the Brazil case study, we see two differing strategies for linking

across the local–global knowledge issue. In the strategy of emulation, local activists worked to develop their own global expertise in order to engage within global debates; in the strategy of adaptation there was greater emphasis on shifting the global discourse to a local context. The GCE pursued yet another strategy: to establish its own legitimacy as a global campaign, it created the global week of action discussed above, but was at pains to be very inclusive in the process of framing the themes for this space, and thus able to transcend global–local divides more successfully. Whatever the dynamics of mobilization around knowledge politics, it is clear that knowledge mediators – be they ‘hybrid activists’, citizen scientists or activist experts – gain growing power if they are able to link multiple discourses and forms of knowledge effectively. Whether the new global knowledge institutions will lead to a more inclusive ‘global civic epistemology’ depends much on who controls and uses them.

Conclusions and implications

This introductory chapter has explored the impact of changing global governance on the meanings and identities of citizenship and the related practices of citizen action. The case studies that follow bring more detailed and nuanced accounts to these debates. What is clear throughout these pages is that for many key issues of global concern – whether they concern health, education, livelihoods, trade or gender – solutions will not arise from action at a single level of governance. Increasingly, global, national and local actors and arenas connect and interconnect, reshaping the contours of power, redefining the nature of governance. Global governance, we have argued, does not mean the replacement of one level of authority with another, but an increased complexity of power, which requires the ability to span spaces and arenas if more inclusive citizenship and effective citizenship action are to be attained.

In this view, we argue that one cannot understand the possibilities of global citizenship by asking simply whether there is a global state that can confer it. The absence of a singular political authority is a challenge but not a constraint for citizen action. In many instances, citizens understand and mobilize around multiple surrogate duty holders who take on new powerful roles, whether they be multinational corporations, private donors or an array of intergovernmental regulatory agencies. At the same time, not only does globalization have consequences for transnational forms of citizen action, but the shifts in global authority also reshape local identities and practices of citizenship. New global authority has implications as citizens move from the local to the global,

but the opposite is also true: new forms of power move from the global to the local as well, opening and constraining possibilities of local action.

In addition to vertical relationships between state and citizen, horizontal solidarities among fellow citizens also define people's sense of who they are, where they belong, and what meanings of citizenship they carry. For those citizens whose state-conferred meaning of citizenship is blurred or ambiguous, or for those who are so discriminated against as to not be able to realize their state-conferred citizenship rights, such horizontal solidarities are major sources of survival and sustenance. Yet neither can these be simply conferred from above, by social movements or other actors.

Taking such a view has given us a complex and somewhat contradictory picture of what is occurring. In some cases, largely in Part Two, the evidence of emerging solidarities and mobilization to hold global duty holders to account is weak, and global power may serve to enfeeble an already fragile citizenship status, even vis-à-vis the national and local state, and increase a sense of exclusion. In others, especially in the cases of campaigns for land rights, education, trade, occupational health and the environment – largely in Part Three – we see a different picture, in which new forms of mobilization, solidarity and claim-making have arisen and, in some cases, succeeded (though, as the case on asbestos reminds us, even within the same movements one can have differential outcomes). In the last chapter, we see some examples of how even among 'orphaned citizens', those without states, a sense of solidarity and appeal to global authority is emerging, challenging us to think even more literally about citizenship beyond the nation-state. In these latter cases, globalizing citizenship can be inclusive and empowering.

What contributes to these differences? Three factors emerge from the case studies as critical. First, the new layers and complexities of authority require mobilization strategies which are able to cut across local-global spaces in a linked and simultaneous way. For many local actors, the reach to the global is difficult; for many global actors, the reverse is also true. Yet, challenging multi-tiered and polycentric forms of power requires multi-tiered and networked forms of action to be effective.

Whether such strategies can be achieved in turn depends on two further factors, the nature and quality of mediation and the dynamics and use of knowledge. As actors and identities span multiple spaces, the role of mediators who can act within and link across spaces becomes ever more important and ever more challenging. Similarly, effective action, linked across actors and arenas, requires being able to use and

link multiple forms of knowledge, and to communicate simultaneously with multiple and disparate audiences. In each of these factors – mobilization, mediation and knowledge – the origin and direction of travel of ‘scale shift’ – whether from global to local, or from local to global – have important impacts on the strategies used.

All of this is of consequence for policy-makers, practitioners and activists alike. Most intervention strategies – be they by donors, governments, NGOs or social movements – still operate in worlds divided by scale. This approach tends to place policies, programmes and interventions that focus at the international level in one department or strategy, the national in another and the local in yet another. While there may be important work linking each of these horizontally to the others – for example, through networks which cut across countries to share experiences or build alliances – rarely do they link vertically in coherent and inclusive ways.

Our analysis would suggest the need for a different approach. Whether led by grassroots activists or high-level policy-makers, by donors, NGOs or social movements, to be effective in the global world, change must link simultaneously and synergistically across levels. Whether intervention from above or mobilization from below, the key challenge is how global power translates to local practice, not how to bring about change in one arena or at one level alone. In this process, close attention must be paid to the capacities and quality of the mediating structures which cut across spaces and levels of action – be they individuals, NGOs or even states – and to forms and framings of knowledge which are genuinely inclusive of multiply positioned perspectives. Success must be understood not only in terms of the change at one level of governance, but in terms of its consequences for power and inclusion in other interconnected arenas as well.

To focus on the changing spatial dimensions of global governance does not imply an undermining of the importance of the nation-state or state-conferred meanings of citizenship. In fact, in this approach, the nation-state has been found to play a critical role, opening or closing the possibilities of effective linking of rights and claims, upwards and downwards, from local to global. The state plays an important role in either assisting or resisting the process of claim-making. Where citizens have kept state agencies in their sights and included them deliberately in their mobilization strategies, the support lent by the state has positively contributed to the realization of such claims.

While the nation-state continues to be important, it is, as we have seen, but one layer of multiple levels of authority. And just as we understand

authority as multi-tiered and complex, so also can we understand the sites of change and the expressions of citizenship as multidimensional. Rather than argue either for national or global, statist or societal, identities of citizenship, it is possible in a global world to imagine these as multiple identities held by the same citizen, who simultaneously may engage with local, national and international forms of authority, and also link with local neighbours or global communities in a range of ways. It is where globalizing forces ignore, or assume to dominate or override, other dimensions of citizenship that they are experienced as exclusionary. On the other hand, as some of the case studies that follow demonstrate, where these multiple senses and identities of citizenship are linked across spaces to engage with multi-tiered and complex forms of global authority, the possibilities of inclusive global citizenship are most likely to emerge. In the twenty-first century, where interconnected global problems will increasingly require multidimensional forms of citizenship to respond, it is these more inclusive forms of citizenship and citizen action which we must seek to foster.

Notes

1 This introduction draws heavily on the conversations and contributions of members of the Global Citizen Engagements Working Group of the Development Research Centre on Citizenship, Participation and Accountability, whose chapters are found in the remaining portions of the book. Our thanks for comments also go to Greg Barrett, Jan Aart Scholte, Fiona Wilson and members of the writers' circle of the Participation, Power and Social Change team at IDS.

2 The range of case studies in this volume is quite broad, but we recognize that there are significant gaps in terms of groups that are challenging nation-state concepts of citizenship (see, for instance, Yashar 2005), and studies in the global North or other significant regions of the world.

3 While in the fields of international relations there is much discussion on the multilayered or

multi-scaled nature of local, national and global governance, others, such as those coming from the field of critical geography, challenge such vertical conceptions of scale and the notion of a 'nested hierarchy' that the local–national–global continuum implies (Marston et al. 2005). While aware of these academic debates, we have nevertheless used the terms 'local', 'national' and 'global' ourselves as shorthand for the different levels of authority and decision-making in which citizen action may attempt to intervene.

4 We shall not be able here to do justice to the richness of these debates. For good summaries and reviews see Falk (1994), Heater (2002) and Schattle (2008). Also, for a good annotated bibliography of literature on global governance and global citizenship, see Benequista and Levine (2009).

5 We agree with Schattle (2008: 4): 'While scholars in recent years

have advanced and debated various theories of global citizenship, we know comparatively little about the practices of global citizenship from the point of view of individuals around the world who now think of themselves as global citizens, as organizations that have linked the idea of global citizenship to their activities, programs and strategies.'

6 Scholte (2008: 323) puts the question this way: 'A citizen's concern is no longer so much "what has my state done about this problem?" as it is "how has the relevant poly-centric governance network affected me and my community?"'

7 De Sousa Santos and Rodriguez-Garavito (2005) challenge the notion of law as top-down and elitist and argue that law evolves through social mobilization and resistance. They further argue that the value of international or global legal processes is how they affect the global and how they protect the local from the negative forces of globalization.

8 Over the course of this project, case study authors met several times to review and discuss their findings. These cross-cutting factors emerged from these discussions.

9 Referring to McAdam, Tarrow and Tilly (2001: 33), Tarrow defines scale shift as 'a change in the number and level of coordinated contentious actions to a different focal point, involving a new range of actors, different objects and broadened claims' (2005: 121).

10 There is a large literature on the challenges of building legitimacy in international civil society, and accountability, and on the challenge of disconnections between global and local actors in transnational campaigns (see, for instance, Batliwala 2002).

References

- Adler, E. and S. Bernstein (2005) 'Knowledge in power: the epistemic construction of global governance', in M. Barnett and R. Duvall, *Power in Global Governance*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 294-340.
- Appadurai, A. (2000) 'Grassroots globalization and the research imagination', *Public Culture*, 12(1): 1-19.
- Archibugi, D. (2008) *The Global Commonwealth of Citizens: Toward Cosmopolitan Democracy*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Batliwala, S. (2002) 'Grassroots movements as transnational actors: implications for global civil society', *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 13(4): 393-409.
- Benequista, N. and T. Levine (2009) 'Literature review on local-global citizen engagement', Prepared for the Development Research Centre on Citizenship, Participation and Accountability in 2006, updated by Greg Barrett in 2009, www.drc-citizenship.org/publications/Local_Global_Literature_Review.pdf.
- De Sousa Santos, B. and C. A. Rodriguez-Garavito (2005) *Law and Globalization from Below: Towards a Cosmopolitan Legality*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Della Porta, D. and S. Tarrow (2005) *Transnational Protests and Global Activism*, Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Ebrahim, A. and E. Weisband (2007) *Global Accountabilities: Participation, Pluralism and Public Ethics*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Edwards, M. (2008) *Just Another Emperor: The Myths and Realities of Philanthrocapitalism*, New York/London: Demos/Young Foundation.
- Edwards, M. and J. Gaventa (2001) *Citizen Global Action*, Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.
- Ellison, N. (1997) 'Towards a new social politics: citizenship and reflexivity in late modernity', *Sociology*, 31(4): 697–717.
- Eyben, R. and S. Ladbury (2006) 'Building effective states: taking a citizen's perspective', Development Research Centre on Citizenship, Participation and Accountability, Institute of Development Studies, Brighton.
- Falk, R. (1993) 'The making of global citizenship', in J. Breder, J. B. Childs and J. Cutter (eds), *Global Visions: Beyond the New World Order*, London: Black Rose Books.
- (1994) 'The making of global citizenship', in B. van Steenberg (ed.), *The Condition of Citizenship*, London: Sage, pp. 127–40.
- Florini, A. (2000) *The Third Force: The Rise of Transnational Civil Society*, Washington, DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.
- Fox, J. (2001) 'Vertically integrated policy monitoring: a tool for civil society policy advocacy', *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 30(3): 616–27.
- (2005) 'Unpacking "transnational citizenship"', *Annual Review of Political Science*, 8: 171–201.
- Heater, D. (2002) *World Citizenship: Cosmopolitan Thinking and Its Opponents*, London: Continuum.
- Held, D. (1995) *Democracy and the Global Order: From the Modern State to Cosmopolitan Governance*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Held, D. and A. McGrew (eds) (2002) *Governing Globalization: Power, Authority and Global Governance*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hoffman, J. (2004) *Citizenship beyond the State*, London: Sage.
- Jasanoff, S. and M. L. Martello (2004) 'Introduction: globalization and environmental governance', in S. Jasanoff and M. L. Martello (eds), *Earthly Politics: Local and Global in Environmental Governance*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, pp. 1–29.
- Kabeer, N. (2005) *Inclusive Citizenship: Meaning and Expressions*, London: Zed Books.
- Keck, M. and K. Sikkink (1998) *Activists beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Leach, M. and I. Scoones (2006) 'Mobilizing citizens: social movements and the politics of knowledge', IDS Working Paper no. 276, Institute of Development Studies, Brighton.
- Lukes, S. (2007) 'Power and the battle for hearts and minds: on the bluntness of soft power', in F. Berenskoetter and M. J. Williams (eds), *Power in World Politics*, London: Routledge.
- McAdam, D., S. Tarrow and C. Tilley (2001) *Dynamics of Contention*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- MacKenzie, H. (2009) *Democratizing Global Governance: 10 Years of Case Studies and Reflections by Civil Society Activists*, New Delhi: Mosaic Books.
- McKeon, N. (2009) *The United Nations and Civil Society*, London: Zed Books.
- Marston, S., J. Jones and K. Woodward (2005) 'Human geography

- without scale', *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 30(4): 416-32.
- Miller, C. A. (2007) 'Democratization, international knowledge institutions and global governance', *Governance*, 20(2): 325-57.
- Mohanty, R. and R. Tandon (2006) *Participatory Citizenship: Identity, Exclusion, Inclusion*, New Delhi: Sage.
- Nyamu-Musembi, C. (2005) 'Towards an actor-oriented perspective on human rights', in N. Kabeer (ed.), *Inclusive Citizenship: Meaning and Expressions*, London: Zed Books.
- Nye, J. (2004) *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics*, New York: Public Affairs.
- Rosenau, J. (2002) 'Governance in the twenty-first century', in R. Wilkinson (ed.), *The Global Governance Reader*, London: Routledge, pp. 45-67.
- Schattle, H. (2008) *The Practices of Global Citizenship*, Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Scholte, J. A. (2002) 'Civil society and democracy in global governance', in R. Wilkinson (ed.), *The Global Governance Reader*, London: Routledge, pp. 322-40.
- (2005) *Globalization: A Critical Introduction*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- (2008) 'Reconstructing contemporary democracy', *Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies*, 15(1): 305-50.
- Stammers, N. (2009) *Human Rights and Social Movements*, London: Pluto Press.
- Tandon, R. (1981) 'Participatory research and the empowerment of people', *Convergence: An International Journal of Adult Education*, 14(3): 20-49.
- Tarrow, S. (2005) *The New Transnational Activism*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Van Steenbergen, B. (1994) 'Towards a global ecological citizen', in B. van Steenbergen (ed.), *The Condition of Citizenship*, London: Sage, pp. 141-52.
- Yashar, D. (2005) *Contesting Citizenship in Latin America: The Rise of Indigenous Movements and the Post-Liberal Challenge*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.