



DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH CENTRE
**Citizenship, Participation
and Accountability**

Literature Review on
Local-Global Citizen Engagement



DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH CENTRE
Citizenship, Participation
and Accountability

Literature Review on Local-Global Citizen Engagement

Prepared by Nicholas Benequista and Tamara Levine for the:
**Local-Global Citizen Engagements
Working Group**

Project convenors:

John Gaventa
Institute of Development Studies
j.gaventa@ids.ac.uk

Rajesh Tandon
Society for Participatory Research in Asia
rajeshtandon@pri.org

September 2006

Preface

The Development Research Centre on Citizenship, Participation and Accountability (Citizenship DRC) is a consortium of seven research institutions supported largely by contributions from the Department for International Development (DFID) and the Rockefeller Foundation. Since July 2000, the Citizenship DRC has conducted research on the topics of rights, citizenship, participation and accountability in Brazil, Mexico, Bangladesh, India, South Africa, Nigeria and the UK.

The consortium, now beginning its second five-year phase, is continuing its work in three thematic working groups1) Deepening Democracy in States and Localities, 2) Violence, Participation and Citizenship, and 3) Local-Global Citizenship Engagements.

This document was prepared by the latter working group, Local-Global Citizenship Engagements, in preparation for a workshop for its members to be held in Brighton, England Sept. 25 to Sept. 27, 2006. This working group will ask how citizens perceive and engage with global processes and in turn, what impact global processes actually have on the meanings and practices of citizenship, given their locations in diverse historical and cultural settings.

This document was commissioned to provide an overview of some of the most prominent academic debates relevant to this research agenda, focusing on authors from UK and U.S. institutions. Researchers from the two other members of the Citizenship DRC – The Society for Participatory Research in Asia, headquartered in New Delhi, and the Centro Brasileiro de Análise e Planejamento, located in São Paulo – conducted parallel reviews of the literature from their respective regions.

The works abstracted in this literature review were selected through an initial keyword search of books and journals at the University of Sussex and the British Library for Development Studies, then by a review of the bibliographies of the publications deemed most relevant. From among the more than 100 works located, the authors selected the most recent and most widely cited items for abstracting, seeking to reflect some of the dimensions of the relevant debates in anthropology, international relations, sociology, development studies, political science and democratic theory.

Two research assistants from the Institute of Development Studies, Tamara Levine and Nicholas Benequista, largely contributed to this literature review under the guidance of John Gaventa, a fellow at the Institute of Development Studies and director of the Citizenship DRC. Rajesh Tandon and Marj Mayo also provided valuable comments on drafts of this document.

An update to the literature review, included in this document as an annex, was carried out by research assistant Greg Barrett in 2009.

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	3
Introduction	4
Global Citizenship	6
Global Governance and Accountability	13
Global Civil Society	25
Global Advocacy and Social Movements	34
Science, Knowledge and Policy	44
Rights, Discourse and Identity	55
Annex I: Supplemental Literature Review on Local-Global Citizen Engagement	63
Preface	64
Global Citizenship	65
Global Governance and Accountability	67
Global Civil Society	70
Global Advocacy and Social Movement	75
Science, Knowledge and Policy	77
Rights, Discourse and Identity	78

Introduction

The state-centric study of citizen engagements is increasingly outdated as the power and authority once held exclusively by the state is fragmented among global, transnational and local actors. While a great deal of research is being conducted on these emerging vertical relationships, there has been no systematic summary to date of the existing literature on this topic. This literature review is an attempt to draw together some of the insights emerging from research looking beyond the state to inform the work of the Local-Global Citizenship Engagements Working Group of the Development Research Centre on Citizenship, Participation and Accountability.

The Local-Global Citizenship Engagements Working Group seeks to understand how this fragmentation is opening new opportunities and new challenges for citizens to engage politically. The group's research is driven by three overarching questions.

- What alliances and identities are linking citizens from the local to the global and from the global to the local?
- How are citizens engaging with global institutions and how do global institutions affect local forms of engagement?
- What difference do these new forms of local-global engagement make to the emergence of new identities of transnational or global citizenship, to the formation of new kinds of alliances and intermediary organisations, and to practices and policies of global institutions?

This literature review has identified six main bodies of literature that are relevant to addressing these questions. Each body of literature draws different theoretical perspectives – including from anthropology, international relations, sociology, development studies, political science and democratic theory – and each body of literature is concerned with distinct social, political and cultural aspects of globalization. Due to time constraints, this literature review could not include the debates on a number of relevant topics. The review, for example, excludes the literature on economic globalization, though one of the themes in many of the publications summarized here is how to create a global political system to more equitably distribute the benefits of the global market. This literature review also largely excludes work on the topic of migration. Furthermore, we were forced to leave out relevant research on the globalisation of mass media and the internationalisation of labour unions. The six bodies of literature that provide the organisation of this literature review are:

- Global Citizenship
- Global Governance and Accountability
- Global Civil Society
- Global Advocacy and Social Movements
- Science, Knowledge and Policy
- Rights, Discourse and Identity

These categories are clearly overlapping and complimentary, but they are to some degree self-identifying and serve mostly to distinguish research by virtue of the focus on different institutions and mechanisms that play a mediating role in interactions that link the local to the global. The first category *Global Citizenship* brings together writings on the legal-philosophical debates on the possibility of citizenship beyond national boundaries. The second category, *Global Governance and Accountability*, focuses on the institutional architecture of the emerging global order and how new supra-state organizations can be kept accountable for their actions. The third part, *Global Civil Society*, looks at the proliferation of civil society associations across national borders in

general and in particular on the issues around transnational civil society organizations, alternatively referred to as international non-governmental organizations. The third category, *Global Advocacy and Social Movements*, compiles work on the flourishing of transnational social movements and international advocacy campaigns, which are unique in their ability to temporarily draw together networks of organizations from across the globe with a shared interest in a particular issue. *Science, Knowledge and Policy* brings together some of the thinking on policy and issue networks across borders that are emerging around the scientific and social complexities of issues such as global warming and HIV/AIDS. The final section, *Rights, Discourse and Identity*, looks at the theoretical insights on the subtle changes to identity produced by the interaction of local and global discourses.

Though each body of literature is concerned with unique issues and institutions, the reader will detect a few major and contrasting visions about the nature of the relationship between the local and global that cross-cuts many of the areas. Some of the literature viewed the relationship between the local and the global as a dialectic characterized by antagonism, emphasizing the trade-offs that occur between global forces and local interests. Other scholars take a ‘glocal’ approach that instead highlights the merging of local and global spaces. Still others characterize local-global citizen engagements as involving a two-way process of translation and interpretation. Future research on local to global citizen engagements should consider whether one of these three dynamics apply, or whether the relationship between the local and the global can be characterized yet another way.

Another theme crosscutting each section is the normative debate on globalisation. Scholars writing in each body of literature are interested in portraying an ethical view of the future world order and in assessing the viability and requirements for realizing that vision. These normative visions are too varied and complex to mention here, but range from the idea of a “global state” to a more organic form of governance based on the spontaneous policy networks that are already emerging. Any research on local-global citizen engagements will inevitably have to situate itself within the context of this encompassing debate.

Global Citizenship

The term ‘world citizenship’ has a multiplicity of contextualised meanings emerging at least in part from overlapping and contested cognitive, political, social and legal notions of ‘citizenship’ at a national level. At its most basic the concept of global citizenship challenges the conventional meaning of citizenship as exclusive membership and participation within a domestic political community.

Since the 1980’s, in the face of globalization and the associated transnationalisation of markets, communications, and civil society, the term ‘global citizenship’ has become increasingly common in public and academic discourse. This ranges from educational institutes seeking to produce alumni that can engage with global cultures and the global marketplace, to multinational corporations projecting images of social responsibility in response to increasingly critical public scrutiny, to political and social activists in various transnational forms calling on global citizenship to inspire cooperation, solidarity, accountability and mobilization across borders.

There are multiple concepts that compete and co-exist within the umbrella of global citizenship. In particular it is possible to distinguish three overarching discourses: a civic republican discourse that emphasizes concepts such as awareness, responsibility, participation and cross-cultural empathy, a libertarian discourse that emphasizes international mobility and competitiveness and a legal discourse that emphasizes legal rights and responsibilities of transnational actors. Those who subscribe to the civic republican view are essentially self-identifying global citizens who embrace political and social awareness, responsibility and participation—and the projection of these into the international arena. This often involves local citizens mobilizing locally who find that eventually to affect change they must mobilize in international spheres. Therefore to the extent that there is a local to global connection in the civic republican discourse it is frequently bottom-up and self-driven. The libertarian discourse tends to highlight the desirability of unimpeded movement across the globe and has received criticism from many academics for promoting and elitist globe trotting lifestyle that erodes local identity and community. The legal discourse increasingly focuses on international and transnational law and whether in fact non-state actors such as transnational citizens, multinational corporations and collectives such as NGOs have rights and responsibilities in international law.

In terms of more exploratory academic literature global citizenship is colonized by a range of disciplines including philosophy, political science and jurisprudence. Philosophers such as Charles Beitz and Onora O’Neill have examined obligations across borders and the possibility of transnational justice. John Rawls (1999) published the widely debated book ‘The Law of Peoples’. Derek Heater and Rickard Falk have been exploring the notion of world citizenship as an extension of citizenship. Martha Nussbaum has drawn on the stoics and on Kant to reformulate an ideal of world citizenship and Andrew Linklater has examined notions of transnational citizenship from an international relations perspective. David Held has explored notions of global citizenship as a political and moral response to globalization. Jurgen Habermas’ theory of discourse ethics provides inspiration for Linklater and some other advocates of Cosmopolitanism. Castles (2000) and Baubcock (1998) have explored notions of migration, immigration and rights and whether emerging notions of global citizenship aid the rights claims of migrant and immigrants. A number of authors such as Robert Dahl, Chris Brown, and Hedley Bull are strongly opposed to these notions of global citizenship and raise issues such as relativism (cultural and legal) as well as the erosion of local community, identity and place.

There has also been an emerging debate about whether international law confers rights of international citizenship with naysayers such as Green and Neff arguing that it does not with Heater and Falk strongly arguing in favour. With the rapid evolution of international law this is a very interesting emerging area to which the DRC may be able to contribute.

The central question underlying this entire body of literature is what the impact of “globalization” or the changing nature of international social, economic, political realities has on notions of citizenship that emerged in a Westphalian world of sovereign states. It asks whether such changes will result in an age of

cosmopolitan citizenship or simply the end of traditional forms of national citizenship or whether there will be new forms of hybrid and multiple-citizenship. These questions relate to broader issues about the nature of international relations and the theoretical debate over the changing nature of international politics and whether such relations will be based: on anarchy and competing interests between nation states (realists), on an international society between states that moderates cooperation, or on a cosmopolitan order transcending state boundaries and focusing on the rights of individuals.

This literature in many ways relates quite closely to the body of literature on rights, particularly human rights in an international context and cosmopolitan notions emerging from international relations and human rights on a responsibility to protect.

Main Questions

- Are their universal rights and obligations applicable to all individuals in all places?
- If so, what are the origins of those obligations and rights?
- How are these obligations and rights claimed, defined and contested?
- How are these rights enforced?
- How do individuals claiming such rights define themselves and/or how are they defined and how does such identification impact their rights claims?
- Are their specific rights and obligations that can be claimed by individuals acting in specific transnational spaces?
- If in fact rights exist beyond borders, what does this mean for the power of the nation state and the relationship between states and citizens?

Abstracted References

De Sousa Santos, B. and Rodriguez-Garavito, C. A. (2005). Law and Globalization from Below: Towards a Cosmopolitan Legality. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press., 1-28.

Falk, R. (1994). The making of global citizenship' in van Steenbergen. (ed) The Condition of Citizenship. London: Sage, 127-40

Fox, Jonathan (2005) Unpacking “Transnational Citizenship.” Annual Review of Political Science. 8 (June): pp 171-201.

Heater, D. (2002). World Citizenship: Cosmopolitan Thinking and Its Opponents. London, Continuum, 1-25.

van Steenbergen, B. (1994). Towards a global ecological citizen. The Condition of Citizenship. B. van Steenbergen. London, Sage. 141-152.

Reference 1 – Global Citizenship

De Sousa Santos, B. and Rodriguez-Garavito, C. A. (2005). Law and Globalization from Below: Towards a Cosmopolitan Legality. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press. 1 – 28.

Main Point

The mobilization of grassroots actors, often in transnational formations, is critical to the evolution of cosmopolitan international law to counteract the forces of globalization. Increasingly attention should be paid to socio-legal disciplines such as legal anthropology and to the interaction between social movements and law.

Overview

This widely cited and broadly circulated book attempts to analyze the role of the law in the global movement for social justice. Case studies in the book are written by leading scholars from both the global South and the global North, and combine empirical research on the ground with innovative socio-legal theory to shed new light on a wide array of topics. Among the issues examined are the role of law and politics in the World Social Forum; the struggle of the anti-sweatshop movement for the protection of international labour rights; and the challenge to neoliberal globalization and liberal human rights raised by grassroots movements in India and indigenous peoples around the world. These and other cases, the editors argue, signal the emergence of a subaltern cosmopolitan law and politics that calls for new social and legal theories capable of capturing the potential and tensions of counter-hegemonic globalization. The book's third chapter "Law and Participatory Democracy: Between the Local and the Global" is particularly relevant to the work of the Citizenship DRC on local to global.

The book focuses on three themes: The construction of a global economy of solidarity, the struggle to reform the international human rights regime in a cosmopolitan bottom-up and multicultural direction, and the radicalization of democratic politics through new forms of participatory democracy.

Beneath these particular case studies is an underlying question about whether legal institutions can respond to increasing transnational social movements and develop mechanisms to enforce the rights and responsibilities of transnational actors (citizens as well as corporations, NGOs and civil society) and in so doing create the back-bone of a more concrete form of global citizenship.

Memorable Quotations

"Among the signs of the emergence of a "solidarity economy" and a cosmopolitan economic law are myriad proposals to protect labour rights in the face of changing economic conditions associated with globalization" (23)

"The construction of an international system of human rights has been weakened by its aforementioned Western and state-centric biases."(25)

"National and transnational institutions suffer from a deficit of democracy. Thus, liberal democracy and law have become less and less credible in both the North and the South." (27)

Local to Global Links

De Sousa Santos challenges the notion of law as top down and elitist and argues that law evolves through social mobilization and resistance. He further argues 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.

Reference 2 – Global Citizenship

Falk, R. (1994). 'The making of global citizenship' in van Steenbergen. (ed) *The Condition of Citizenship*. London: Sage, 127-40

Main Point

Global Citizenship is a normative undertaking that should be pursued by all those wanting to promote a more harmonious cosmopolitan order.

Overview

This chapter penetrates the question and meaning of global citizenship. Falk debates whether there is an inevitable historical trajectory from the city via the nation-state and the region to the global. He argues that there are at least some exceptions to any possible rule, citing how Europe has remained inward-looking, sustaining a relatively insular posture towards contemporary world history.

Falk seems to promote global citizenship as a normative undertaking leading to a global community based on social responsibility, solidarity and the inherent value of nature. Yet, he recognizes that current notions of global citizenship are not all in line with this vision. Interestingly, he distinguishes five notions of global citizenship: the global reformer, the elite global businessman, the manager of the world order emerging from a struggle to highlight environmental problems, the politically conscious regionalist (which may or may not be a step towards globalism) and the emergent transnational activist. These categories of global citizen do overlap. For example, both the manager of world order and the transnational activist categories address forms of environmental activism/stewardship. Nevertheless all the categories also conflict in interesting ways.

Memorable Quotations

"Citizenship is tied to democracy and global citizenship should in some way be tied to global democracy, at least to a process of democratization that extends some notion of rights, representation and accountability to the operations of international institutions and gives some opportunity to the peoples whose lives are being regulated, to participate in the selection of leaders" (128).

"For the sake of human survival, then, some forms of effective global citizenship are required to redesign political choices on the basis of an ecological sense of natural viabilities, and thereby to transform established forms of political behaviour." (132)

"There is implicit in this ecological imperative a politics of mobilization, expressed by transnational militancy, and centring on the conviction that it is important to make 'the impossible' happen by dedicating actions that is motivated by what is desirable, and not discouraged by calculations of what seems likely" (132)."'

"A recovery of a dynamic and positive sense of citizenship responsive to the varieties of human situation and the diversity of cultural values, presupposes a radical reconstruction of the reigning political culture that informs and underlies political behaviour in the modern, postmodern West."

Local to Global Links

Falk argues that local behaviour and actions are increasingly tied to universally accepted norms and values.

Reference 3 – Global Citizenship

Fox, Jonathan (2005) Unpacking “Transnational Citizenship.” *Annual Review of Political Science*. 8 (June): pp 171-201.

Main Point

There are emerging rights and ideas that suggest citizenship beyond the state, but notions of global citizenship are idealistic, according to Fox, who argues that at present it is transnational citizenship is limited to multiple or dual citizenship.

Overview

Drawing on recent findings in sociology, anthropology, and geography but primarily based in the political science discipline this essay assesses the degree to which the concept of transnational citizenship helps to address issues raised by “globalization from below.” It uniquely integrates two distinct empirical literatures; one on transnational civil society and one on migrant civic and political participation. Fox concludes that only a very bounded definition of transnational citizenship – what is traditionally referred to as dual or multiple citizenship - is useful. He argues that notions of global or transnational citizenship that go beyond these forms are “conceptual stretching” and do not meet the true definition of citizenship.

He argues that definitions of citizenship vary along two main dimensions: in their emphasis on rights versus membership, and in high versus low intensity. A large portion of the essay probes the relationship between claiming rights and gaining membership, arguing that while rights are only constituted by being exercised, only some attempts actually win respect for rights – creating a paradox of citizens who occasionally have rights in the international sphere but not at home. Therefore he concludes that transnational civil society is necessary but not sufficient for transnational citizenship.

He further probes the nature of cross-border networks and coalitions arguing that many such groups do not constitute transnational movements and do not share objectives or a true political community. He then examines cross-border migrant politics and voting rights, but points out that there is a difference between transnational and translocal membership, arguing that for many individuals their closest cross-border ties are to a community rather than a nation.

Finally, he concludes by arguing that there are three main forms of transnational citizenship – parallel, simultaneous and integrated, examines the concept of flexible citizenship and distinguishes between “thick” and “thin” rights.

Memorable Quotations

“The concept’s usefulness – so far – is limited to those migrant civic and political rights and memberships that could also be described, perhaps more precisely, as “dual” or “multiple” citizenship. The rest of what might look like transnational citizenship turns out to consist primarily of genres of civic and political participation and membership that fall short of the category of citizenship.” (172)

Local to Global Links

Fox argues that while forms of transnational citizenship are emerging people’s main source of identity remains local. Therefore there is an emerging connection between local and global forces that often circumvent national identities/forces.

“Sometimes what seem to be transnational collective identities may be more precisely understood as translocal identities. For many migrants, their strongest cross-border social ties link specific communities of origin and settlement, without necessarily relation to national social, civic or political arenas in either country.” (187)

Reference 4 – Global Citizenship

Heater, D. (2002). World Citizenship: Cosmopolitan Thinking and Its Opponents. London, Continuum. 1-25.

Main Point

The notion of world citizenship remains weak unless it is able to stand alongside and be comparable to citizenship in its traditional state-embedded sense

Overview

Recent years have seen the development of a substantial literature on cosmopolitan political thought and the idea of world citizenship. In this book Derek Heater offers a concise and accessible survey of this complex debate. He aims both to interpret these concepts and to assist in their comprehension.

Central to the organization of the book is Heater's claim that the notion of world citizenship remains weak unless it is able to stand alongside and be comparable to citizenship in its traditional state-embedded sense. Thus, the core chapters are arranged according to a basic breakdown of the key components of citizenship, covering: identity and morality; law and civil rights; social, economic and environmental citizenship; political citizenship; and competence and education.

The author outlines and assesses both supporting and opposing arguments, illustrating his analysis with wide-ranging historical and political references, from the Stoics to the present day.

Memorable Quotations

“International law is now edging towards the acceptance of a world law under which supranational courts can try and commit for punishment citizens of any state who violently transgress the universal code of human rights and humane behaviour. Indeed the very acceptance of the notion of universal human rights reveals a belief that a higher code than that delineated for state citizens is expected and obedience to it can be required of individuals.” (P. 24)

Local to Global Links

Local identities, legal processes and cultural, social and political organizations are increasingly tied to international norms and laws and emerging universal values of global citizenship.

Reference 5 – Global Citizenship

van Steenbergen, B. (1994). Towards a global ecological citizen. *The Condition of Citizenship*. B. van Steenbergen. London, Sage. 141-152.

Main Point

There ought to be a global ethic of caring for the environment and such an ethic would create a global common identity of global ecological citizens.

Overview

This book begins with a classic examination of citizenship drawing on Marshall's famous essay 'Citizenship and Social Class' (1949). Van Steenbergen argues that the civil, political and social notions of citizenship that emerged from Marshall and have been central up until modern day are no longer adequate in modern day society. He therefore examines a number of emerging notions of citizenship with specific emphasis on *inclusion* and *exclusion* and internationalization. The notions of citizenship examined in the book include: neo-republican citizenship, cultural citizenship, race-neutral citizenship and gender-neutral citizenship, global citizenship, European citizenship and ecological citizenship.

In Chapter 11, Van Steenbergen unpacks the notion of environmental citizen. He argues that there are two types of environmental citizens: first, there is the *earth citizen*, who is aware of his or her organic process of birth and growth out of the earth as a living organisms. They are characterized by caring (as opposed to controlling) and as participants in nature rather than rulers or subjugators. In contrast he argues that 'global environmental citizens' or 'World Citizens' view the environment as 'big science' and the planet as an object of global management, which requires large scale organizations and big government.

Memorable Quotations

"The 'World Citizen' as distinct from the 'earth citizen' looks at him or herself primarily as a self made person who is 'master of the universe' and looks at the globe as a place for 'take off'. He or she has no particular links with the planet as his or her 'breeding ground'. This is particularly true for the global capitalist, who, as we have seen, is foot-loose, and who has no sense of place.

Local to Global Links

Local environmental stewardship depends on an emerging global ethic of caring for the environment and notions of global environmental citizenship.

Global Governance and Accountability

The emergence of “multi-actor, multi-level” structures has led international relations scholars and political scientists to debate the future of the global order. Rules, regulations and policies are increasingly determined by these suprastate, regional and transnational forces through a process that has been termed “global governance.” Significant disagreement remains, however, over what that means.

Held identifies three dimension of the debate; philosophical, empirical-analytical, and strategic. At a philosophical level, the discussion over global governance is concerned with conceptual and normative tools for analysing world order. The literature on *world citizenship* captures much of the moral and legal philosophy that feeds into this discussion, including the theoretical questions that have arisen over the nature of authority since diffuse forms of authority have begun to challenge the Weberian notion of a centralized power.

At an empirical-analytical level, the work on global governance is concerned with the problems of understanding and explaining world order. Central to the philosophical and empirical-analytical debate is the changing role of the nation-state. Held, himself a cosmopolitan, argues that the nation-state remains the strategic site for weaving together the multiple channels of influence in global governance. Rosenau, on the other hand, argues that a shift from formal *command* to informal *control* of governance has bifurcated authority between transnational and subnational processes, diminishing the role of the state.

Finally, the literature on global governance is strategically concerned with an assessment of the feasibility of moving from where we are to where we might like to be. S. Khagram and S. Ali present as many as six potential models for the future of global democracy, ranging from world statism to institutional heterarchy, outlining the assumptions and values that underlie each typology.

Perhaps more relevant for the work of the Citizenship DRC, however, are the debates focussed specifically on how the rise of global governance has enabled and constrained citizen participation. Clearly, globalization has opened new points of influence for shaping policy, but who gains access to those points and how different actors exercise influence remains unclear. Dana Clark and Jonathan Fox argue that the experience of the World Bank Inspection Panel suggests potential for internal accountability mechanisms to amplify citizen voice, though such measures also face important limitations. R. O'Brien and Anne-Marie Goetz depict a dialectic for change in global governance resulting from a collision between the multilateral economic institutions and global social movements. Ronnie Lipschutz, however, has a much more pessimistic outlook, arguing from a discursive analysis that global civil society mostly contributes to the spread of neo-liberal logic.

Main Questions

- What is the meaning of borders and sovereignty when governance is so diffuse and jurisdictions are so overlapping?
- What are the implications of more polycentric and networked governance for the nature of political identity and democracy with respect to global governance?
- How can and do individuals practice citizenship and democracy with respect to global governance?
- How can citizens influence global markets and global power?

Abstracted References

Clark, D., J. Fox, et al., Eds. (2003). Demanding Accountability: Civil-Society Claims and the World Bank Inspection Panel. Lanham, Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 247-275.

Held, D. and A. McGrew, Eds. (2002). Governing Globalization: Power, Authority and Global Governance. Cambridge, Polity Press, 1-21.

- Keohane, R. and J. S. Nye Jr. (2000). Introduction. Governing in a Globalizing World. J. S. Nye Jr. and J. Donahue. Cambridge, Visions of Governance for the 21st Century, 1-41.
- Khagram, S. (2006). "Possible Future Architectures of Global Governance: A Transnational Perspective/Prospective." Global Governance. 12: 97-117.
- Lipschutz, R. (2004). Global civil society and global governmentality: or, the search for politics and the state amidst the capillaries of social power. Power in Global Governance. M. Barnett and R. Duvall. Cambridge and London, Cambridge University Press, 229-248.
- O'Brien, R., A.-M. Goetz, et al. (2000). Contesting global governance: multilateral economic institutions and global social movements. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1-23.
- Rosenau, J. (2002). Governance in the Twenty-First Century. The Global Governance Reader. R. Wilkinson. London, Routledge, 45-67.
- Scholte, J. A. (2002). Civil Society and Democracy in Global Governance. The Global Governance Reader. R. Wilkinson. London, Routledge, 322-340.

Reference 1 – Global Governance and Accountability

Clark, D., J. Fox, et al., Eds. (2003). Demanding Accountability: Civil-Society Claims and the World Bank Inspection Panel. Lanham, Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 247-275.

Main Point

The book examines whether the World Bank Inspection Panel, which allows local people affected by World Bank-funded projects to file a complaint and request an investigation into whether World Bank policies were violated, is a viable mechanism for increasing the voice and representation of people excluded from policy processes. It is also a detailed account of how local, national and international civil society actors mobilize to influence a global institution.

Overview

The book explores the history of the Inspection Panel through nine case studies, concluding in a final chapter that the panel has in fact amplified the voice of the poor and marginalized at the Bank and has been a catalyst for broader change at the organization. The authors also ascertain that claims are most likely to be filed against large infrastructure projects on the grounds of violating the Bank's environmental and social safeguard policy framework. Most of the claims were filed by Southern actors, others by coalitions between Northern and Southern actors, and only one by an exclusively Northern NGO. Bank management has been antagonistic with the panel and defensive against complaints, though panel recommendations have been accepted in every case since the second review. Claimants, however, have often faced the greatest hostility in their host countries, facing violence and imprisonment in some cases.

While the authors positively highlight the contribution this mechanism makes to both the empowerment of grassroots actors and the internal World Bank culture, they did note that there were some limitations. Specifically, the panel is limited by the rather narrow language of the safeguard policies and by virtue of its having jurisdiction solely over World Bank employees, often leaving citizens with no measure to seek redress against state officials or private firms.

Memorable Quotations

“For leaders of the dominant international institutions, the idea that they should be transparent and held publicly accountable was once unthinkable.” (xi)

“The inspection Panel has inserted a key political concept into the World Bank’s governance model – that the institution must be accountable to the people directly affected by its lending. The Inspection Panel has given increased legitimacy to the claims of local people affected by the World Bank, and it serves as a forum through which their voices have been amplified within the institution.” (247)

Local to Global Links

The panel was itself the product of a combination of years of activist and diplomatic pressure, but the edited volume suggests that spaces for accountability within an organization such as the World Bank can be a valuable catalyst of change and empowerment for marginalized groups. That said, the Inspection Panel’s mandate and scope remains limited, and satisfaction with the outcomes has been mixed.

Reference 2 – Global Governance and Accountability

Held, D. and A. McGrew, Eds. (2002). *Governing Globalization: Power, Authority and Global Governance*. Cambridge, Polity Press, 1-21.

Main Point

This article, more than any other in this section, sets the stage for the debates on the present and future of global governance by identify the distinct philosophical outlooks that underpin the various sides of the discussion.

Overview

This edited book brings together some of the seminal works on global governance. The editors summarize some of the debates on the issue current in international relations and political science. They describe ‘global governance’ as ‘the nexus of systems of rule-making, political coordination and problem-solving which transcend states and societies.’ These systems are multilayered, including the suprastate (UN), the regional (EU, Mercosur), the transnational (civil society, business networks), the national, and the substate (community associations, city governments). It is polyarchic or pluralistic by virtue of having no single locus of authority. It is also characterised by its variable geometry, referring to how the political significance and regulatory capacities of these infrastructures vary greatly around the globe. It is also structurally complex, being composed of diverse agencies and networks with overlapping jurisdictions. Held, himself a quintessential cosmopolitan, argues that national governments become *strategic sites* for “suturing together these various infrastructures of governance and legitimizing regulation beyond the state.” The authors refer to Keohane and Nye’s seminal work Power and Interdependence, which stimulated an avalanche of studies on why states engage in international cooperation and institution building. The authors identify three accounts at the heart of this debate: the liberal institutionalist, the realist, and the neo-Gramscian.

Memorable Quotations

“Given the absence of a world government, the concept of global governance provides a language for describing the nexus of systems of rule-making, political coordination and problem-solving which transcend states and societies. It is particularly relevant to describing the structures and processes of governing beyond the state where there exists no supreme or singular political authority. Theoretically, it is much more than simply a descriptive term: it constitutes a broad analytical approach to addressing the central questions of political life under conditions of globalization, namely: who rules, in whose interests, by what mechanisms and for what purposes?”

Local to Global Links

If anything, this article suggests that local-global citizen engagement in the context of global governance is tenuous given that structures of global governance are currently driven to a large degree by larger geo-political forces.

Reference 3 – Global Governance and Accountability

Keohane, R. and J. S. Nye Jr. (2000). Introduction. *Governing in a Globalizing World*. J. S. Nye Jr. and J. Donahue. Cambridge, Visions of Governance for the 21st Century, 1-41.

Main Point

Keohane and Nye provide a concise summary of the major issues under debate in the arena of global governance, with an emphasis on the nature of current globalization, the fate of the nation-state and the path toward more democratic global governance.

Overview

Keohane and Nye describe globalization as the current thickening of *globalism*, which refers to the networks of interdependence at multicontinental distances, through an increased density of networks, faster institutional change and more transnational participation. The effect on governance, the authors argue, is an expansion of governance activities outside of nation-states, illustrated in the table below. However, they emphasize that nation-states will continue to be central in governance structures.

	PRIVATE	GOVERNMENTAL	THIRD SECTOR
SUPRANATIONAL	TNCs	IGOs	NGOs
NATIONAL	Firms	Central	Non Profit
SUBNATIONAL	Local	Local	Local

For one, borders continue to hinder global economic integration to a large degree. The effects of globalization on income inequality will also be variable between rich and poor countries, and depend largely on the political systems in place in each country. The authors also point out that globalization affects state institutions differently, and does not weaken them categorically.

In response to globalization, they identify two new trends in global governance; the emergence of networks among agents and the rise of norms, standards of expected behaviour, as governing principles. These trends have challenged the multilateral model of global governance that has predominated since the Bretton Woods conference of 1944, putting into relief a democratic deficit in these institutions. The authors argue, however, that principles of democratic governance cannot be translated into the international arena. Legitimacy of global governance agencies will have to depend more on outcomes than on majoritarian voting procedures and other input-based measures of accountability.

Memorable Quotations

“Contrary to some prophetic views, the nation-state is not about to be replaced as the primary instrument of domestic and global governance. There is an extensive literature on the effects of globalism on domestic governance, which in our view reaches more nuanced conclusions.” Pg. 12

“From the perspective of multilateral cooperation, this club model can be judged a great success. The world seems more peaceful, more prosperous, and perhaps even environmentally somewhat cleaner than it would have been without such cooperation. However, the very success of multilateral cooperation has generated increased interdependence – now in the form of “globalization” – that threatens to undermine it.” Page 26

Local to Global Links

Keohane and Nye appear to suggest in this introductory chapter that citizen engagement in global gover-

nance will remain largely indirect, mediated by the state. They stress the need for greater transparency in the practices of global governance actors, but seem to say that such actors will be held to account *ex-post*, judged by their success at reducing inequality, reversing environmental degradation, and preserving peace, etc. This position appears in conflict with other voices calling for a more active and direct role of citizens in shaping these institutions.

Reference 4 – Global Governance and Accountability

Khagram, S. (2006). “Possible Future Architectures of Global Governance: A Transnational Perspective/Prospective.” *Global Governance*, 12: 97-117.

Main Point

Khagram outlines the possible future configurations of the changing world order, arguing that one of six models will replace the warring parochialisms and civilization clashes that are now predominant.

Overview

- 1) Khagram describes several images of future global governance architecture, remarking that any would in fact be preferable to what he describes as the current state of global disorder. The six normative-analytical categories include:
- 2) Multilateralism – This would entail greater democratization of interstate relations, including more measures for accountability and transparency to the member states.
- 3) Grassroots globalism – This suggests a radical decentralization of authority and even potentially the eradication of multinational corporations in favour of more communal modes of production.
- 4) Multiple regionalisms – Authority in this model would shift to regional centres from the nation-state. Indeed, these regions would not necessarily be comprised of ‘states’ at all.
- 5) World statism – National government writ large, comprising a democratically elected world government with a monopoly on force.
- 6) Networked governance – These may be *transgovernmental* or *multistakeholder*, including non-state actors, but offer a more organic and perhaps efficient form of addressing global issues.
- 7) Institutional heterarchy – citizenship as a dialogical process of “expanding the horizons of one’s own framework of meaning, and increasing the scope of mutual understanding.

Memorable Quotations

“Without a much more concerted focus on the “forest” of broader global governance architectures, the net result of the necessary but insufficient separate analysis and disjoint restructuring of specific organizations and institutions will likely be continued dysfunctionality.” (113)

Local to Global Links

These categories, however distant or unrealistic they may seem, offer a useful device when addressing the topic of global governance. What’s more, Khagram makes a clear point that without a normative goal, the current trend in global governance is anarchic and without a clear idea of how, when, why and to whom global governance actors should be accountable.

Reference 5 – Global Citizenship and Accountability

Lipschutz, R. (2004). Global civil society and global governmentality: or, the search for politics and the state amidst the capillaries of social power. *Power in Global Governance*. M. Barnett and R. Duvall. Cambridge and London, Cambridge University Press, 229-248.

Main Point

Lipschutz tries to define what global civil society is by looking through the lens of institutional and productive power. In the process, Lipschutz builds a critique of global civil society, suggesting that actors in this arena fail to challenge the discursive logic of neoliberalism.

Overview

While Alex Colas argues that global civil society is merely “international” and remains linked to nation states, Lipschutz, among others, suggest instead that forms of global governance constitute a state-like political framework that generates global civil society.” Or you could argue, from the perspective of classical political economists, that global civil society is connected to the global market. He says there are two ways of explaining the existence of global civil society; agential and structural. He suggests there should be a third, looking at global civil society as an effect of productive power in the Foucauldian sense. In this chapter, he argues that “GCS is produced by agents resisting the expansion of the market but acting in ways that either unwittingly support the logics of governmentality or deliberately oppose it.”

He suggests that CSOs try to exercise compulsory power on states. Though this influence remains negligible compared with the regulatory power imposed on states by corporations and capital, “few CSOs mount structural critiques of the system they are trying to change, inasmuch as this risks charges of radicalism, socialism, and even terrorism.”

Memorable Quotations

“CSOs tend to use institutionalised forms of market power in order to alter consumer behaviour and corporate management practices.” (232)

“... it is the state’s structural power to expand the realm of private property in favour of capital that is the focus of ethical challenges by social movements and where the productive power of civil society is exercised most effectively.”

“To mix metaphors, it is not sufficient to focus on the size of the pie’s slices, it is necessary to act to change the filling, the crust, and, indeed, the pudding itself. And that is something that the agencies and organizations of global civil society, as they are constituted today, cannot do and will not do.” (248)

Local to Global Links

Lipschutz provides an important critique of global civil society’s role in mediating citizen engagement with global processes, using discourse analysis to show that civil society organizations rarely challenge free-market logic, instead mobilizing citizens largely to *use* market principles to shape policies, standards and norms. This strategy, he says, may yield limited benefits for poor and marginalized groups.

Reference 6 – Global Governance and Accountability

O'Brien, R., A.-M. Goetz, et al. (2000). Contesting global governance: multilateral economic institutions and global social movements. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1-23.

Main Point

The authors suggest that multilateral economic institutions are colliding with the interests of global social movements, producing a new form of ‘complex multilateralism’ that has the potential to reconfigure the global order into increasingly pluralized governing structures. The authors take the examples of the IMF, the World Bank and the WTO as multilateral economic institutions and the environmental, labour and women’s movements as case studies of social movements.

Overview

Since the 1980s, multi-lateral economic institutions have increasingly engaged with social groups, changing the nature of global governance. The book looks at the relationship between three MEIs and three global social movements; the IMF, the World Bank, and the WTO and the environmental, labour and women’s movements. They argue that the interactions between these organizations and social movements has changed institutions leading to increasing recognition that institutions other than states can speak for public interest. This change, however, has yet to significantly alter the policies of such organizations.

This struggle, the authors say, is essentially a struggle over multilateralism – between the top-down, state-centric and bottom-up multilateralism. This not only entails institutional transformations since the actors on each side of the struggle have distinct political interests. The challenge to the old form of multilateralism has come under the nomenclature of transparency and accountability. “New Multilateralism,” as it has been labelled by its proponents, has emerged from work conducted by the United Nations University, most prominently Cox, Gill, Krause, Knight, Sakamoto and Schechter, who have made a case for a system based on participative civil society. This project is still emerging, it builds upon organizations that are independent from the state, and it is counter-hegemonic. The current outcome of this movement, the authors suggest, is the creation of a hybrid, which they call complex multilateralism.

Amid this complexity, multilateral economic institutions and social movements are locked in a zero-sum battle, whereby actors on one side seek to preserve current policies and global social movements seek to change the policy path. Neither are succeeding in this environment, though multilateral economic institutions are beginning to recognize the social impacts of their policies.

Memorable Quotations

“The collision between powerful economic institutions and social movements in many countries has led to a contest over global governance. The contest takes place both over the form of the institutions (their structure, decision-making procedures) and over the content of their policies (free market oriented or a balancing of social values). It is this contest that is the subject of this book.” Page 2

Local to Global Links

This book offers a powerful framework for understanding the local-global citizen engagement as a dialectic between the goals of international financial institutions to spread the global market, and local efforts to resist. The result of this antagonism is the current dynamic of change in global governance institutions.

Reference 7 – Global Governance and Accountability

Rosenau, J. (2002). Governance in the Twenty-First Century. *The Global Governance Reader*. R. Wilkinson. London, Routledge, 45-67.

Main Point

In this seminal article, Rosenau presents a framework based on the notions of “command and control” to discuss the less formal face of global governance, the structures such as international non-governmental organizations, global campaigns and policy networks that are shaping governance.

Overview

Control over global governance has largely replaced command, highlighting the purposeful nature of governance without presuming the existence of hierarchy. With an increased concentration of organizations in the world and the increased fragmentation of authority, the world is more anarchical now than ever, he claims, allowing greater flexibility, innovation and experimentation in the development of new control mechanisms. In this context, successful governance mechanisms depend more than ever on bottom-up processes for building legitimacy. Rosenau suggests that the new overlapping flows of authority have led to a bifurcation whereby national mechanisms of control are giving way to both transnational governance mechanisms and subnational governance mechanisms, a trend highlighted also by the work of Saskia Sassen. Subnational governance mechanisms may not cross borders, but they are nonetheless confronted with similar new challenges such as the relevance of scientific findings and the epistemic communities that form around those findings and with the pressures for further fragmentation of subgroups on the one hand and for more extensive transnational links on the other. Rosenau identifies two different steering mechanisms of global governance; one top-down and one bottom-up. In the top-down mechanism, states create new institutional structures and impose them. Conversely, transnational political action and the market have created new interactions that eventually foster habits and attitudes, which are eventually adopted by institutions. He argues that emerging transnational organizations like NGOs and social movements serve needs that can no longer be filled by national governments, providing control on issues that cannot be addressed by the nation-state. As a result, at a subnational level, cities and microregions are assuming new responsibilities.

Memorable Quotations

“It follows that systems of rule can be maintained and their controls successfully and consistently exerted even in the absence of established legal or political authority. The evolution of inter-subjective consensus based on shared fates and common histories, the possession of information and knowledge, the pressure of active or mobilised publics, and/or the use of careful planning, good timing, clever manipulation, and hard bargaining can-either separately or in combination-foster control mechanisms that sustain governance without government.” (47)

“In order to acquire the legitimacy and support they need to endure, successful mechanisms of governance are more likely to evolve out of bottom-up than top-down processes. As such, as mechanisms that manage to evoke the consent of the governed, they are self-organizing systems, steering arrangements that develop through the shared needs of groups and the presence of developments that conduce to the generation and acceptance of shared instruments of control.”

“...the clash between the incentives induced by markets and the authority of governments is central to the emergence of transnational governance mechanisms. Indeed, it is arguable that a prime change at work in world politics today is a shift in the balance between those two forces, with political authorities finding it increasingly expedient to yield to economic realities.”

Local to Global Links

Rosenau offers a theoretical framework that allows for a more comprehensive understanding of how top-down and bottom-up processes interact in the new forms of global governance. This interaction, in his view, is less antagonistic than portrayed, for example by O'Brien, suggesting instead a blurring of local and global as the role of the nation-state is eroded.

Reference 8 – Global Governance and Accountability

Scholte, J. A. (2002). Civil Society and Democracy in Global Governance. *The Global Governance Reader*. R. Wilkinson. London, Routledge, 322-340.

Main Point

The statist formula of accountability does not suffice for institutions of global governance. In light of the relatively unchecked power of suprastate institutions, citizens have turned to civil society to obtain greater democratic accountability. Scholte identifies four ways in which civil society associations have demanded accountability, and six circumstances that have limited the success of civil society in this endeavour.

Overview

Four mechanisms have provided a means for civil society to demand greater accountability from suprastate institutions; transparency, policy monitoring and review, pursuit of redress, and through the promotion of formal accountability mechanism. Civil society has pressured these organizations regularly for greater and more effective transparency, pushing formerly opaque decisions into the public light. Once policy practices have been made visible, civil society organizations have been able to challenge these practices with greater legitimacy and impact. Furthermore, civil society organizations have pushed to have rules changed, officials replaced and reparations paid in cases when policies and practices have led to clear harm to communities. Lastly, civil society has campaigned for more institutionalized measures of accountability of beneficiaries and to the various levels of state government. Six factors have been crucial to the success or failure of civil society in these efforts; the availability of resources, access to networks, the attitudes of officials, the receptivity of the mass media, the political culture of a given country or region and, finally, the accountability of civil society groups themselves.

Memorable Quotations

“In relation to contemporary world politics, civil society might be conceived as a political space where voluntary associations seek, from outside political parties, to shape the rules that govern one or the other aspect of social life. Civil society groups bring citizens together non-coercively in deliberate attempts to mould the formal laws and informal norms that regulate social interaction.” (90)

Local to Global Links

Scholte argues that civil society organizations are an essential mechanism for forcing the agencies of global governance to be accountable to citizens, but stresses that civil society has not provided an easy answer either to the challenges of global governance. Parliaments, judiciaries, official expert evaluations and the mass media are also key elements in diminishing the discretion, and at times impunity, of global institutions.

Global Civil Society

This section highlights work that has examined the proliferation of civil society associations across national borders. Explorations of “global civil society” often include considerations of global social movements such as the international opposition to genetically-modified foods, global networks such as the one joined by the Global Fund to Fight Aids, Tuberculosis and Malaria, and international advocacy campaigns such as the boycott against Nestle. However, since those particular forms of global civil society are treated separately in this literature review, this section will highlight instead some of the work focused on transnational civil society organizations, alternatively referred to as international non-governmental organizations; the sort of bureaucratic organizations like CARE with clear structures and hierarchies of command.

One significant portion of this literature is dominated by industry insiders asking about how to make their organizations more responsive, effective and accountable to beneficiaries. According to Arjun Appadurai, these organizations are facing the challenges of cooptation, corruption and elite capture as they grow, but also the deeper strategic challenge of staying fluid, responsive and flexible – resisting forces of the process that drive organizations to be more hierarchical, bureaucratized, slow and ultimately conservative. John Clark points out the great irony and challenge of global civil society lies in how it contributes to democracy though often remains, in itself, undemocratic. Similarly, Ann Florini underscores the need to keep transnational civil society transparent and accountable if it is to serve local interests.

According to Helmut Anheier, this emphasis on internal architecture is a shortcoming of current scholarly work on the topic, neglecting the individuals, their attitudes and actions. To be sure, several scholars are indeed seeking to understand the ideas and people that form global membership organizations to enquire into how such actors are shaping democracy in new ways. Most prominently, Srilatha Batliwala suggests that global civil society is best understood as a set of values, norms and aspirations. Others describe global civil society as filling the “democratic gap” emerging as solutions to problems such as climate change and HIV/Aids, are increasingly beyond the ken of nation states. Yet others depict global civil society as a form of resistance to economic globalization and cultural hegemony.

The debate on defining the origins and nature of global civil society matters as the label gains authority in national and international policy fora. Arjun Appadurai warns that how academics ultimately describe global civil society may in part determine its uncertain future. Some scholars have suggested that the notion of global civil society itself has become prejudiced toward large, northern NGO's, neglecting how globalization is occurring from the bottom up and consequently bestowing legitimacy on only a few organizations.

The approach to “seeing like a citizen” developed by the Citizenship DRC complements the incipient work of Batliwala, Appadurai and others who also envision global civil society as a normative struggle. The work of the DRC could make a valuable contribution to this literature.

Main Questions

- Who participates and why?
- What are the origins of global civil society?
- How to distinguish between the descriptive, strategic and normative uses of global civil society?
- How does civil society position itself in relation to nation states? Is transnational civil society interested in protecting the nation-state from globalization or does it benefit from the erosion of national sovereignty?
- Can radically different understandings of the term ‘civil society’ in regions with different histories be represented within the idea of a global civil society?

- How can global civil society be politically and legally secured?
- What roles can civil society play in global governance?
- Can this society perhaps help to redefine the universal entitlements and duties of the peoples of the world?

References Abstracted

Appadurai, A. (2006). Foreword. Transnational Civil Society: An Introduction. S. Batliwala and D. L. Brown. Bloomfield, CT, Kumarian Press, xi-xv.

Batliwala, S. and D. L. Brown, Eds. (2006). Transnational Civil Society: An Introduction. Bloomfield, CT, Kumarian Press, 1-14.

Clark, J. (2003). Introduction: civil society and transnational action. Globalizing civic engagement: civil society and transnational action. J. Clark. London, Earthscan, 1-27.

Colas, A. (2002). International Civil Society: Social Movements in World Politics. Malden, MA USA, Blackwell Publishers Ltd, 1-24.

Florini, A., Ed. (2000). The third force: the rise of transnational civil society. Washington D.C., Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 211-240.

Kaldor, M., H. Anheier, et al. (2005). Introduction. Global Civil Society Yearbook 2004/5. H. Anheier, M. Glasius and M. Kaldor. London, Sage Publications Ltd, 1-22.

Keane, J. (2003). Global Civil Society? Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1-39.

Reference 1 – Global Civil Society

Appadurai, A. (2006). Foreword. *Transnational Civil Society: An Introduction*. S. Batliwala and D. L. Brown. Bloomfield, CT, Kumarian Press, xi-xv.

Main Point

Appadurai argues that transnational civil society should focus on providing ‘voice’ (referring to Hirschmann’s three types of political attachments) – which implies both maintaining commitment to a political system while at the same time providing criticism. Transnational civil society, he writes, should make ‘its central project the building of a critical voice in the face of what look like the inevitable demands of economic globalization.’

Overview

Appadurai argues that transnational civil society is simultaneously a project, a process and a space. As a project, it seeks to make global processes accessible and visible to citizens, as a process, it is network building, alliance formation and advocacy, and as a space, it is ‘interstitial, overlapping and uneven,’ challenging the previous order of nation, region and world we once imagined. He says that three mistakes are commonly made of global civil society. It is not, he writes, the benign democratic counterpart of globalization and thus does not do the same across national boundaries that it supposedly did within nations. Nor is it purely a resistance to market-driven globalization. The third mistake is committed by those involved in building civil society and encompasses the challenges of making global civil society more responsive, inclusive and equitable. Appadurai sees the greatest need of global civil society in the tasks of bending market principles to produce social equilibria and promoting ‘everyday peace.’

Memorable Quotations

Transnational civil society is “a project, process and a space, all in search of an unresolved sociological form. Finding such a form is the central challenge of all those actors who want to make this vision real.” (1)

As a project, “transnational civil society is a strategy to make global processes visible and accountable to ordinary citizens who might otherwise be confined to national political arenas.” (2)

“Hope is not just a mood or disposition; it is a socially and culturally sustained capacity, which can be systematically nurtured and redistributed.” (8)

Local to Global Links

Appadurai’s perspective suggests that global civil society’s principle role in local-global citizen engagements is providing ‘voice.’ By the same token, the challenge facing global civil society is ensuring the legitimacy of that voice.

Reference 2 – Global Civil Society

Batliwala, S. and D. L. Brown, Eds. (2006). *Transnational Civil Society: An Introduction*. Bloomfield, CT, Kumarian Press, 1-14.

Main Point

This chapter introduces the edited volume by seeking to describe the limits and defining characteristics of transnational civil society. Their approach to defining global civil society is novel in its use of values, norms and aspirations as a defining criteria.

Overview

Batliwala and Brown seek to define transnational civil society and to identify the most important questions facing the sector. They identify three aspects for understanding transnational civil society:

- 1) The sector of civil society associations – it is composed of nonprofit and nongovernmental organizations, churches, unions, social movements and many other agencies and is formed independently by citizens in pursuit of their interests. Some TCSOs are centralized bureaucracies, like CARE. Others are loosely structured forms, using more consensual methods of decision making. These can be networks or transnational coalitions and campaigns. A third, less common form is transnational movements, which share features of networks and coalitions/campaigns - common values, shared information and discourse, common strategies and tactics - but additionally engage in mobilization around an issue.
- 2) The values, norms and aspirations of a society governed by civil processes – tolerance, trust, cooperation, non-violence, inclusion and democratic participation. By virtue of this element of the definition, the authors are deliberately excluding other transnational formations with different goals – such as Al Qaeda, for example. The authors suggest that the critical question facing transnational civil society in this dimension is how the values and norms embodied in these organizations can become more constructive, leading to negotiated agreements and building a civil global society.
- 3) The provision of spheres for public discourse on issues and ideas – transnational civil society is in this sense a collection of communication processes and structures that enable widespread sharing and dissemination of discourses on critical issues. Some transnational discourses, such as about environmental conservation and women's rights, have reshaped transnational agreements on values, norms and assumptions. When and how such public discourses reshape institutional values, norms, standards and/or expectations should be the focus of future research, they write.

Memorable Quotations

“On many of the issues in this book, civil society initiatives to catalyze a better transnational society have demonstrated more capacity to block action than to create a new consensus on appropriate norms and standards. In part this stems from the fact that campaigns often depend on mobilizing outrage at unacceptable behaviour (“Nestle Kills Babies”), but it is difficult to transform that indignation into negotiating agreements that would support more civil relations in the future.” (8)

Local to Global Links

By definition, Batliwala and Brown imply that global civil society provides a space that links the local and the global in shaping values, norms and standards. They identify the tolerance, trust, cooperation, non-violence, inclusion and democratic participation as among the predominant values emerging from this forum, but point to a need for further understanding in how to translate these ideas into new institutional forms.

Reference 3 – Global Civil Society

Clark, J. (2003). Introduction: civil society and transnational action. *Globalizing civic engagement: civil society and transnational action*. J. Clark. London, Earthscan, 1-27.

Main Point

The shift beyond a national focus to a transnational focus necessitates major changes in the structure and governance of CSOs and is influencing both their mandates and cultures.

Overview

Based on interviews with CSO's and networks as well as the literature and conclusions from the London School of Economics and Political Science Seminar, the introduction looks at the various organizational arrangements that are used in global civil society. The introductory chapter summarizes the key governance challenges – issues of representation, legitimacy, accountability, leadership, decision-making and use of name. The chapter also briefly surveys the changes occurring in the focus, mandate and culture of CSO's that are increasingly working internationally, asking how this trend affects issues of membership and partnership. Finally, Clark highlights some conclusions for how global civil society can help face these challenges. The introduction also contains a useful table detailing the characteristics of various transnational civil society forms by categorizing the mode of decision-making, leadership style, communications, governance (accountability, transparency, representativity), motivations for participation, nature of outside partnerships, clarity of strategy.

Memorable Quotations

“Two key variables influencing transnational citizen action are the degree of decentralization, exemplified by the above organizational forms, and the degree to which decision-making lies with volunteers and CSO members (via elected committees of representatives) or with professional staff in international secretariats. Do CSOs help citizens to achieve a voice for themselves or do they speak for citizens? The former are more evidently representative and democratic; the latter usually have swifter, clearer decision-making and may appear more professional.” (5)

“There is, therefore, a paradox. NGOs have recently emerged within well-established democracies (North and South; East and West) as influential voices in their special fields, and they are increasingly seen as plugging the deficiencies in orthodox democracy created by globalization (Clark, 2003). They contribute to democracy, but most influential NGOs are not, in themselves, democratic.” (8-9)

Local to Global Links

This article focuses on the institutional structures that mediate the relationship between the local and global through transnational civil society. Clark provides a fairly comprehensive description of the unique strategies and modalities used by such organizations to address issues of representation, legitimacy, accountability, leadership, decision-making and use of name; issues with important ramifications for how citizens engage with global forces.

Reference 4 – Global Civil Society

Colas, A. (2002). *International Civil Society: Social Movements in World Politics*. Malden, MA USA, Blackwell Publishers Ltd, 1-24.

Main Point

This book provides a critical survey of recent approaches to the study of civil society and international relations, presenting an alternative historical and sociological account of the interaction between these two spheres. It makes a theoretical case for the importance of social movements in world politics by arguing that modern social movements emerging out of civil society have been instrumental in shaping the contemporary international system.

Abstract

Colas argues that global civil society is a historical reality, rather than a political project. This book elaborates on this relationship between the analytical and normative dimension of global civil society. There are two central claims. First, that the globalisation of civil society is a process which has been unfolding -however unevenly- over the past three centuries, mainly as a result of the world-historical impact of the 'Age of Atlantic Revolutions'. Secondly, that this very unevenness in the global reproduction of civil society has generated complex and variegated expression of a global civil society. By looking at the particular experience of civil society under colonial and post-colonial rule he illustrates how the notion of global civil society has at once an older and more contested history than is usually allowed for in contemporary discussions. One consequence of this, he concludes, is that many expressions of contemporary global civil society can be seen as negative socio-political reactions to the very liberal attempts at promoting global civil society as a 'project to be realized.'

Memorable Quotations

"The social movements operating within civil society have displayed international characteristics from their inception." (1)

"Civil society offers a public arena separated from both the market and the state where individuals and collectives can, through successful mobilization, realize the full potential of modern liberal citizenship" (43)

"Cosmopolitan democracy...can not...be reduced a mere regulation or administration of the disjunction thrown up by capitalist globalization. It must also, and fundamentally, entail the exercise of autonomy and self realization through a legitimate political community" (161)

Local to Global Links

Colas' work is useful in its emphasis on the historical dimensions of civil society, highlighting how civil society has served as a link between the local and the global for much of the last three centuries.

Reference 5 – Global Civil Society

Florini, A., Ed. (2000). *The third force: the rise of transnational civil society*. Washington D.C., Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 211-240.

Main Point

Written for a general public, this edited volume compiles six cases of successful transnational networks to suggest that the role of such organizations, while facing limits, will inevitably increase with globalization. Significant effort will be required to keep this ‘third force’ transparent and accountable, she claims.

Overview

This edited volume compiles six case studies to examine transnational networks, asking how powerful they are, whether the sources of their power are sustainable and what role for transnational civil society is desirable. The editor, Florini, provides a final chapter reflecting on these issues with reference to the case studies, which include Transparency International, the nuclear test ban movement, the activism that promoted the World Commission on Dams, the Zapatista uprising, and the International Ban on Landmines and the international efforts to hold former dictator Augusto Pinochet to account.

Florini concludes that such networks have power at every stage of the policy process, though particularly at getting issues onto the agenda. This power, however, works indirectly by influencing others, and as such remains limited. Furthermore, the case studies demonstrate that international civil society still depends on domestic nodes. As the nation state retains the greatest political authority, domestic civil societies continue to exert the greatest pressure. This, however, may change as globalization itself provides an increasing number of focal points for civil society, including new policy networks and inter-governmental organizations.

She largely avoids the question of whether the growing role of international civil society is desirable, suggesting that whatever the answer, it may in fact be inevitable. She suggests instead that future efforts look at how to make global civil society more transparent and accountable.

Memorable Quotations

“As the case studies indicate, transnational civil society cannot float free in a global ether. It must be firmly connected to local reality.” (217)

“...to governments trying to protect national security through weapons programs they deem proper, to owners of dam-building firms who believe they are providing a major public benefit through the development of needed infrastructure, to societies trying to reform themselves from the inside, transnational civil society can seem disruptive, narrow-minded, and above all unaccountable.” (232)

“In short, the existence of intergovernmental efforts to address transnational issues has helped spur the development of transnational civil society coalitions. As states form more and more IGOs and undertake more and more negotiations on everything from investment to money laundering to the protection of dolphins, transnational civil society finds itself with a plenitude of convenient focal points for its efforts. And as transnational civil society grows, it seeks new issue areas for which it demands intergovernmental negotiations and organizations, creating additional avenues to draw in more of civil society.” (227)

Local to Global Links

Based on the collection of case studies, Florini makes a specific point about the power of transnational civil society. Its power, she says, lies in the ability to influence agenda-setting, more than in any other stage of the policy process, through indirect means of persuasion. As a local-global link in citizen engagement, this volume thus portrays global civil society’s current role as rather limited.

Reference 6 – Global Civil Society

Kaldor, M., H. Anheier, et al. (2005). Introduction. Global Civil Society Yearbook 2004/5. H. Anheier, M. Glasius and M. Kaldor. London, Sage Publications Ltd, 1-22.

Main Point

An annual publication that reviews academic publications, current events, case studies and statistics from the past year relevant to global civil society.

Overview

The authors summarize the current debates on the topic of global civil society, illustrating each aspect with reference to the situation in Iraq. They define global civil society as ‘a sphere of ideas, values, institutions, organizations, networks, and individuals located between the family, the state and the market, and operating beyond the confines of national societies, politics and economies.’ Scholars interested in this area generally focus on one of three forms of civil society; on international NGOs, on global social movements, or on transnational networks. The authors characterize the various positions of these different actors along two axis; between those that favour global governance and those that defend the nation-state and sectarian groups, and between the politically left and right. The introduction also includes a summary of the current debates on the individual and identity in this process, asking how globalization is reshaping identities based on nationality, ethnicity, religion or other labels. Finally, the chapter reviews some of the perspectives on democracy and global civil society, emphasizing a stark disagreement over the fate of the nation-state and the future form of global governance.

Memorable Quotations

“Civil society is about managing difference and accommodating diversity and conflict through public debate, non-violent struggle, and advocacy. Historically, civil society was bounded by the state; it was about managing difference within a bounded community and about influencing the state. What we mean by global civil society is not just civil society that spills over borders and that offers a transnational forum for debate and even confrontation; rather, we are concerned about the ways in which civil society influences the framework of global governance – overlapping global, national and local institutions.” (2).

“Individuals try to forge, negotiate and reconcile their own world views and notions of self with that of society. Given the multiple roles people perform in modern, diverse societies, this more ‘soft-wired’ form of identity is not only evolving, it is also precarious and precious. It refers less to identity as ‘self’ than to identity in relation to categories such as nation, religion, place or belonging.” (9-10)

Local to Global Links

This introduction does not contribute any particular insight into local-global citizen engagements, but does provide perhaps the best overview of global civil society. According to Kaldor and Anheier’s portrayal, global civil society provides an emergent space – to some degree beyond the nation-state, the family and the market – for forming new values and ideas. This space, however, remains highly contested; between the politically left and right, between those in favour of global governance and those that defend the nation-state.

Reference 7 – Global Civil Society

Keane, J. (2003). Global Civil Society? Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1-39.

Main Point

Keane takes an analytic-descriptive approach – using global civil society to probe the past and present. He also uses global civil society to look at strategic political calculation, concerning itself with what must be done to reach goals like freedom and justice, presumed to be inherently desirable by the author. Finally, the book takes a normative perspective, arguing why global civil society is ethically a good thing.

Overview

Keane describes civil society as ‘the political vision of a world founded on non-violent, legally sanctioned power-sharing arrangements among many different and interconnected forms of socio-economic life that are distinct from governmental institutions. He argues that global civil society can serve as a universal concept and be politically and legally secured if it is interrogated as a set of ethical principles. In the concluding chapter, Keane argues against the particularist and realist interpretations of global civil society to suggest the possibility of a cosmopolitan order. This book expounds that argument with greater erudition than I have seen other publications.

Memorable Quotations

“The ethic of global civil society steers a course through Plato and post-modernism, and in doing so it goes beyond each of these two extreme ways of thinking about ethics. Like post-modernism and other species of pluralism, the ethic of global civil society celebrates social diversity, but it does so by asking after the universal preconditions of dynamic social diversity.” (201)

“Global civil society is not an ethical First Principle in this sense. It cannot and should not be compared to the belief in Universal Satisfaction, or a God, or to any other species of other-worldly or this-worldly Universal Principle that subordinates and stifles all particularities. Global civil society is rather to be interpreted as an implied logical and institutional precondition of the survival and flourishing of a genuine plurality of different ideals and forms of life.” (201)

Local to Global Links

Keane’s work resonates with other authors in this section that portray global civil society as a set of ideas or space for contesting values and normative visions of the future. He contributes to this approach by offering a rigorous approach to defining the ethics emerging from global civil society, a step that he argues is crucial to codifying these principles into law.

Global Advocacy and Social Movements

This literature examines how particular local mobilizations are linked to national and global economics, politics, and social trends and movements. It examines the networks, strategies, ideas and values and spaces that enable transnational advocacy and their development and formation. It probes fundamental issues related to accountability, legitimacy, reputation, credibility, tools and influence strategies, organization structure, issue construction, and enabling environments.

The literature can be divided into a number of categories specifically looking at NGO's, networks and movements. Of particular interest are new emerging global policy networks in which certain state actors form continual networks of communication with NGOs, the private sectors, individuals as well as international bodies. It is also of value to note that not all transnational social movements pursue what would be termed progressive aims and that there is a growing awareness of the impact of more conservative social movements such as religious fundamentalist movements.

There are clearly significant overlaps between this literature and that of Global Civil Society. In particular, there is the issue of bias within global civil society toward large NGOs and questions about the legitimacy and power of small local NGO's that are often relegated to 'grassroots' status. One central question focuses on how small local groups and movements can become connected through diffuse global networks based on common vision and understanding to gain international influence.

Main Questions

- What are the catalysts for local mobilizations?
- Who participates in these mobilizations and why?
- How do global processes, networks and resources impact local mobilizations?
- How do local groups interact with global economic, political and social movements?
- How do global advocacy and social movements impact global economic, social and political processes?
- Have these movements or can these movements help to redefine obligations and rights of citizens? Of people in transnational spaces?

References Abstracted

Bandy, J. and J. Smith (2005). Coalitions Across Borders: Transnational Protest and the Neoliberal Order, Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc, 1-17.

Batliwala, S. (2002). "Grassroots movements as transnational actors: implications for global civil society." Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations 13(4): pp. 393-409.

Callaghy, T. M., R. Kissimil, et al. (2001). Intervention and transnationalism in Africa: global-local networks of power. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1-23.

Della Porta, D. and S. Tarrow (2005). Transnational Protests and Global Activism, Rowan and Littlefield Publishers, 1-18.

Edwards, M. and J. Gaventa (2001). "Citizen Global Action." Boulder: Lynne Rienner Press, 1-14, 275-287.

Keck, M. and Sikkink (1998) Activist Beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics. London. Cornell University Press, vii-38.

VeneKlasen, L., V. Miller, et al. (2004). Rights-based approaches and beyond: challenges of linking rights and participation. IDS Working Paper. Falmer, Institute of Development Studies, ii-52.

Reference 1 – Global Advocacy and Social Movements

Bandy, J. and J. Smith (2005). Coalitions Across Borders: Transnational Protest and the Neoliberal Order, Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc, 1-17.

Main Point

There are numerous transnational coalitions of actors resisting neo-liberalism and the dominant capitalist classes/ideologies of our globalised world. These social movements, however are not homogeneous. They are characterized by conflict and cooperation and each movement is identified by unique, context-sensitive characteristics.

Overview

This book demonstrates how social movements have cooperated and conflicted as they work to develop a transnational civil society in response to perceived threats of neoliberalism - free trade, privatization, structural adjustment, and unbridled corporate power. The authors explore the processes of transnational mobilization, discussing the motivations and methods of cross-border cooperation as well as the conflicts that have affected the ability of movements to promote social change. The original case studies included in this volume represent a diverse cross-section of transnational movement coalitions from various regions and nations representing different interests, and addressing a range of economic injustices. *Coalitions across Borders* reveals the many social conditions that enable and constrain the formation of transnational civil societies and the ways in which movement actors manage conflicts as they work toward common goals.

Memorable Quotations

'Transnational associations ...are important structures for democratic discourse and participation in a global polity, and they must be made much stronger in order to make global integration consistent with democracy' (12)

Local to Global Links

Bandy argues that it is the creative engagement of local grassroots actors across borders that is reformulating and resisting globalization to ensure that global development progresses in a manner that is of interest to the majority of the world's people.

Reference 2 – Global Advocacy and Social Movements

Batliwala, S. (2002). "Grassroots movements as transnational actors: implications for global civil society." *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations* 13(4): pp. 393-409.

Main Point

Globalization has changed the meaning of 'grassroots' in ways that may disguise real differences in power, resources, visibility, access, structure and ideology and may misleadingly group the people directly affected with their champions and spokespersons. Batliwala calls for a sharpening of social movements theory to make this distinction and to understand the ways in which the globalization of real grassroots movements may challenge the legitimacy of international civil society organizations.

Overview

The past two decades witnessed the emergence of a new range of transnational social movements, networks, and organizations seeking to promote a more just and equitable global order. With this broadening and deepening of cross-border citizen action, however, troubling questions have arisen about their rights of representation and accountability, particularly in relation to the internal hierarchies of voice and access within transnational civil society. The rise of transnational grassroots movements, often with a strong constituency base and sophisticated advocacy capability at both local and global levels, is an important phenomenon in this context. These movements are formed and led by poor and marginalized groups and defy the stereotype of grassroots movements being narrowly focused on local issues. They embody both a challenge and an opportunity for democratizing, legitimizing, and strengthening the role of transnational civil society in global policy. Batliwala illustrates her point with two case studies of local organizations that mobilized globally; Women in the Informal Economy Globalizing and Organizing and Slum/Shack Dwellers International.

Memorable Quotations

"Global NGOs and civil society networks, while representing the issues and concerns of poor or marginalized people in global policy realms, often have few formal or structural links with direct stakeholder constituencies. Their "take" on issues and strategic priorities is rarely subject to debate within the communities whose concerns they represent. When interrogated closely, one finds that their priorities and positions are not necessarily derived through any convincing process of grassroots debate and legitimization." (397)

Local-Global Links

Batliwala challenges the notion of what is considered "local" in this article, pointing to how the term "grassroots" has been used and abused as to obscure important distinctions between transnational actors related to power, resources, visibility and access. Batliwala makes a compelling case for academics to pay greater attention to a form of local-global engagement that has been overlooked, neglected or mistakenly lumped in together with other forms of transnational citizen action; grassroots organizations such as the Slum/Shack Dwellers International that have mobilized across borders.

Reference 3 – Global Advocacy and Social Movements

Callaghy, T. M., R. Kassimir, et al. (2001). Intervention and transnationalism in Africa: global-local networks of power. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1-23.

Main Point

In sub-Saharan Africa, in countries where failed states have left a vacuum of authority, social mobilizations and transboundary alliances between grassroots actors and global civil society has arisen as a strategy in order to produce, destroy or transform local and national order.

Overview

The book calls attention to ‘transboundary formations’ - intersections of cross-border, national and local forces that produce, destroy or transform local order and political authority. It analyzes the intervention of external forces in political life, both deepening and broadening the concept of international ‘intervention’ and the complex contexts within which it unfolds. While transboundary formations can emerge anywhere, they have a particular salience in sub-Saharan Africa where the limits to state power make them especially pervasive and consequential. Including conceptual contributions and theoretically-informed case studies, the volume considers global-local connections, taking a fresh perspective on contemporary Africa’s political constraints and possibilities, with important implications for other parts of the world.

Local to Global Links

In order to resist oppressive or illegitimate state authority, grassroots actors form alliances with like-minded local, national and international actors. Such transboundary formations have impacts on not only local and national power and political formation but also on the global hegemony of certain capitalist interests.

Reference 4 – Global Advocacy and Social Movements

Della Porta, D. and S. Tarrow (2005). Transnational Protests and Global Activism, Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 1-18.

Main Point

Globalization is resulting in multi-level governance with an increasing role for grassroots actors in international policy processes.

Overview

This book examines the nexus between the local and the global in translating the global justice movement into action at the grass roots, and vice versa. Using recent cases of transnational contention—from the European Social Forum in Florence to the Argentinean human rights movement and British environmentalists, from movement networks in Bristol and Glasgow to the Zapatistas— it adapts current social movement theory to what appears to be a new cycle of protest developing around the globe.

Chapter 1: Transnational Processes and Social Activism: An Introduction

Abstract/Summary

Della Porta and Tarrow argue that the growing use of concepts such as “multi-level governance”, “world polity” and “global civil society” are testaments to a shift in the locus of political power as a result of globalization and associated social, cultural and geopolitical changes. The chapter argues that internally there has been a shift in power from parliaments to the executive and within the executive to the bureaucracy and quasi-independent agencies. Externally, there has been a shift from national to supranational and regional institutions with particularly amplified power in international economic institutions such as the WTO and the IMF and multinational corporations. They further argue that there has been an expansion of informal cross-border networks reacting to this shift in power and resisting the power of the capitalist entities. The chapter goes on to examine diffusion - the spread of movement ideas, practices and frames from one country to another, domestication - playing on domestic territory of conflicts that have their origin externally; and externalization - the challenge to supranational institutions to intervene in domestic problems or conflicts. Mostly they focus on transnational collective actions or the coordinated international campaigns on the part of networks of international actors, other states or international institutions.

Memorable Quotations

‘A growing stream of research on social movements has identified three important processes of transnationalisation: diffusion, domestication and externalization...the recent evolution of movements focusing on “global justice,” peace and war, or both, suggest some additional processes. The most important of the three and the one that emerges most clearly from the chapters in this book, is what we call “transnational collective action” – that is *coordinated international campaigns on the part of networks of activists against international actors, other states or international institutions.*’ (2)

Local to Global Links

Local grassroots actors' knowledge, creative mobilization and participation is becoming increasingly important in global policy arenas.

Reference 5 – Global Advocacy and Social Movements

Edwards, M. and J. Gaventa (2001). "Citizen Global Action." Boulder: Lynne Rienner Press

Main Point

The broadening of citizen action into the global sphere results in new power relations in which power at local and global levels are increasingly intertwined.

Overview

This book explores how citizens' voices and citizen participation affect institutions, decisions and issues taken beyond the local level or even the nation state. It argues that the broadening of citizen action into the global sphere results in new power relations in which power at local and global levels is increasingly intertwined. It examines the impact and challenges of this dynamic through a series of in-depth case studies from both practitioners and academics in order to examine the meaning and possibilities of citizen action at the global level as well as the notion of 'global citizen' itself.

Memorable Quotations

"Global citizen action implies action at multiple levels – local, national and international – which must be linked through effective vertical alliances. The most effective and sustainable forms of global citizen action are linked to constituency building and action at the local, national and regional levels. It is equally important that such action be "vertically aligned" so that each level re-enforces the other." (281)

Local to Global Links

Power at local and global levels is increasingly intertwined with local actors influencing global processes and vice-versa. Local actors are organizing in new ways and increasingly forming transnational networks. The success of these networks can be attributed to their ability to form vertical alliances.

Reference 6 – Global Advocacy and Social Movement

Keck, M. and Sikkink (1998) Activist Beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics. London. Cornell University Press, vii-38.

Main Point

Local actors can gain power in relation to authoritarian regimes through creative transnational mobilization that ultimately uses international pressure to open up national and local spaces for resistance and contestation.

Overview

This, now classic, analysis of transnational advocacy networks was a pioneering work that details the means through which civil society campaigns gain power vis-à-vis authoritarian regimes by creatively reaching out across borders to use international pressure to open up domestic political space.

Transnational advocacy networks are defined as groups composed of membership across borders distinguished from corporations and other transnational entities such as epistemic communities by the fact that their primary motivation is shared ideas or values, and they are engaged in ‘voluntary, reciprocal and horizontal exchanges of information and services.’

Keck and Sikkink identify four clusters of strategies and techniques: Information politics (gathering and providing information, dramatizing facts by using testimonies), symbolic politics (use of symbolic events and conferences to publicize issues), leverage politics (linking issues of concern to money, trade or prestige and persuading more powerful actors such as the World Bank to exert pressure) and accountability politics (reminding governments or institutions of living up to previously endorsed principles). The case studies (in particular the ones on human rights advocacy networks in Argentina and Mexico) show that many activities of advocacy networks follow the ‘boomerang pattern’ (p. 13): State A blocks redress to organizations within it; they activate networks, whose members pressure their own state and (if relevant) a third-party organization, which in turn pressure State A.

In conclusion they argue that the key determining factors for the success of transnational advocacy networks are the strength and density of the networks, the vulnerability of the target state or organization, domestic structures (the nature of domestic institutions and

society) and the nature of the relevant issue. The case studies show that issues involving ‘bodily harm to vulnerable individuals and legal equality of opportunity’ are most conducive to successful mobilization (204). Finally, they assert, that effective advocacy networks contribute to a transformed understanding of national interest in a target state.

Memorable Quotations

“However amenable particular issues may be to strong transnational and transcultural messages, there must be actors capable of transmitting those messages and targets who are vulnerable to persuasion or leverage.” (28)

“Like epistemic communities, transnational advocacy networks rely on information, but for them it is the interpretation and strategic use of information that is most important. Influence is possible because the actors in these networks are simultaneously helping to define the issue area itself, convince target audiences that the problems thus defined are soluble, prescribe solutions, and monitor their implementation.” (30)

“Organizations and individuals within advocacy networks are political entrepreneurs who mobilize resources like information and membership and show a sophisticated awareness of the political opportunity structures within which they are operating.” (31)

Local to Global Links

In order to gain power local actors reach out across national borders to the international or global sphere. International actors then apply pressure on the nation state opening up space for actors to claim their rights locally and nationally.

Reference 7 – Global Advocacy and Social Movements

VeneKlasen, L., V. Miller, et al. (2004). Rights-based approaches and beyond: challenges of linking rights and participation. IDS Working Paper. Falmer, Institute of Development Studies, ii-52.

Main Point

A synthesis of a series of working papers developed by IDS and Just Associates, this article explores consequences of a convergence between rights-based activism and international development, suggesting that the combination holds the potential to better combat entrenched power and thus address the root causes of poverty.

Overview

The development industry is gradually incorporating the language of rights, while rights groups are increasingly using participatory methods. VeneKlasen looks at how participatory methods in conjunction with a rights perspective can better address power in its visible, hidden, and invisible dimensions. VeneKlasen depicts rights as more national and international in origin, and participation as a local link, each with shortcomings and strengths. RBA, for example, sometimes fails to map out power structures, emphasizing advocacy and lobbying over empowerment. Participation on the other hand is about communities gaining the ability to define their own reality and propose solutions for their own felt needs. The term, however, has been used as a mere tool to increase project performance (World Bank) with an emphasis on its ability to increase efficiency. For many, integrating rights means simply adding rights lingual and an activist, legal or advocacy element to the project. They conclude that linking rights and participation with the notion of power is necessary to clarify the paradigm.

Memorable Quotations

“Capacity building must go beyond technical skills to those of political analysis for assessing contexts, risks, power and underlying causes of a problem.”

“While working with laws and legal systems is critical for rights work, it has become clear that narrow legal approaches usually fail to expand the scope of rights or appreciably strengthen accountability and capacity to deliver resources and justice.”

“Good development practice emphasises the importance of starting where people are, a hard-won lesson that has not been part of many human rights groups’ knowledge base or experience.”

“Rights and advocacy are the policy side of development and participation work, making government and other power institutions responsive and accountable. Participation and development are the practical side of rights and advocacy work providing concrete ways for people to live in dignity and health.”

Local to Global Links

VeneKlasen’s article highlights how the incorporation of a rights-based approach to development has a potential to transform *development* into a critical mechanism for local-global citizen engagement. Similarly, the incorporation of participatory methods into rights activism may promote a rights agenda more in tune with local perspectives.

Science, Knowledge and Policy

This body of literature examines the relationship between knowledge and power, particularly in the context of globalization and the growing recognition of the need for more effective engagement between the local and the global in policy formation. It questions the means by which narratives based on particular knowledge-power formations are arrived at, contested, defended, or ignored.

Much of the literature questions the supremacy of modern Western technical expertise or science. Its origins lie in concepts of precaution, indigenous knowledge, public participation in decision-making and the integration of social science into modern policy making. Many of these ideas have become widely accepted in policy circles.

Adler and Bernstein provide a deep philosophical analysis of knowledge and episteme construction arguing that the framing of policy dialogues is central to power and inequality in global governance structures. Appadurai takes these arguments one step further, arguing that the discourse of globalization itself is top driven and that inequalities will only be rectified when there are greater efforts to visualize globalization from below with the associated bottom-up constructions of both the language and ideas of an alternative understanding of globalization. Backstrand specifically looks at power/knowledge dynamics in scientific policy advice arguing that the boundaries between the science and policy domains are fluid and constantly (re)negotiated. She embraces the idea of extended peer community, participatory scientific assessment and public participation. Fisher looks specifically at the growing antagonism between technical knowledge and scientists and citizens and their knowledge. Jasanoff looks at the role of knowledge in Global Environmental Governance and Leach and Scoones look at knowledge dynamics in social mobilisation. What are the implications of complex non-linear social, political and ecological systems for knowledge generation, risk deduction and hence policy making?

Main Questions

- Whose narratives are heard in policy decision making and whose narratives are ignore, why?
- What strategies, techniques and networks have been used to highlight alternative narratives and why have they or have they not been successful?
- How are new emerging challenges such as biotechnology and climate change challenging traditional science-policy relationship? How are the policy processes around these issues re-enforcing specific narratives?
- How does the existing global architecture re-enforce certain narratives? How might this be addressed/changed?

References Abstracted

Adler, E. and S. Bernstein (2005). Knowledge in power: the epistemic construction of global governance. Power in Global Governance. M. Barnett and R. Duvall. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 294-340.

Appadurai, A. (2000). "Grassroots Globalization and the Research Imagination." Public Culture 12(1): pp. 1-19.

Backstrand, K (2004) "Scientisation vs. Civic Expertise in Environmental Governance: Ecofeminist, Eco-modern and Post-modern Responses." Environmental Politics. 13(4): pp. 695 – 714.

Fischer, Frank. 2000. Citizens, Experts and the Environment: The Politics of Local Knowledge. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 1-31.

Fuller, Steve and Collier, James (2003). Philosophy, Rhetoric and the End of Knowledge: A New Beginning for Science and Technology Studies. Madison. University of Wisconsin P, xi-xxii.

Jasanoff, S. and M. L. Martello (2004). Introduction: Globalization and Environmental Governance. Earthly Politics: Local and Global in Environmental Governance. S. Jasanoff and M. L. Marteloo, MIT Press, 1-29.

Leach, M. and I. Scoones (2005) Mobilizing Citizens: social movements and the politics of knowledge. Citizenship DRC Synthesis Paper, DRAFT - November 2005, 1-25.

Reference 1 – Science, Knowledge and Policy

Adler, E. and S. Bernstein (2005). Knowledge in power: the epistemic construction of global governance. In Power in Global Governance. M. Barnett and R. Duvall. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 294-340.

Main Point

Knowledge and episteme construction and framing is central to power and inequality in global governance structures.

Overview

The authors reintroduce a modified conception of episteme into the international relations literature to argue that power is a disposition (in the sense of ordering and controlling) that depends on knowledge. Power is also productive in the sense of defining the order of global things (they paraphrase from Michael Foucault). In addition they try to show that power's productive capacity is often followed by the development of formal and informal institutions that play a role in fixing meanings, which are necessary for global governance. Second, they put forward a normative theory of the requirements of global governance that builds on these notions. They argue that global governance rests on material capabilities and knowledge, without which there is no moral governance. Third, they bring these insights to bear on a brief discussion on the effects of epistemes on emerging pockets of global governance and the possibilities and limits of moving global governance in a more sustainable and just direction. They use international trade and the related legal system to illustrate the above relationship and call attention to the fact that, even when thinking about the United States and its use of unprecedeted material capabilities vis-à-vis the rest of the world, power, and its effect on global governance, takes a productive form through knowledge and, in particular epistemes.

Local to Global Links

Local capabilities and knowledge are the foundation of informed policy making and effective Global Governance.

Reference 2 – Science, Knowledge and Policy

Appadurai, A. (2000). "Grassroots Globalization and the Research Imagination." *Public Culture* 12(1): pp. 1-19.

Main Point

There needs to be greater efforts to compare, describe and theorize “globalization from below” and engage grassroots actors in the development of their own epistemes and vocabulary to promote creativity and to counteract the domination of top-down globalization research.

Overview

Appadurai argues that academia may be missing the point on globalization. Academic debates, particularly in the U.S., have become parochial and increasingly separate from the vernacular discourses of globalization worldwide. Given that political struggle increasingly involves epistemological contestation, he argues that the results of globalization in terms of equity will depend largely on academic inquiry. As such, Appadurai calls for a focus on “globalization from below,” comprised of those actors seeking to preserve democracy and autonomy in the face of global power.

This presents three challenges. First, it requires a new lens for study. Appadurai points out a “growing disjunction between the globalization of knowledge and the knowledge of globalization.” This is caused primarily by globalization’s peculiar characteristic of being an uneven process. Consequently, globalization unequally distributes the resources for learning, teaching and cultural criticism that are most vital for the forms of collaboration necessary for understanding globalization.

The second challenge is that globalization has created multiple “disjunctures” that manifest themselves in local forms of conflict, though are often the result of transnational and global forces. Appadurai lists several examples including how flows of human rights discourses across border generate demands from workforces that may be repressed by state violence, which is itself backed by global arms flows. The solution to this, he says, is imagination in social life.

Terms like “international civil society” used by academics do not accurate capture the dynamic quality of these forms of imagination. Furthermore, academics need to recognize that their work is itself part of a wider geography of knowledge, and as such part of this process of global imagination.

This leads Appadurai to argue for a new approach to area studies that is focused more on process geographies - trade, travel, pilgrimage, warfare, proselytisation, colonisation, exile, etc. - and less on trait geographies, and for a reflection on the ethics of research itself to promote a knowledge of globalization that fosters democracy, in the sense of applying Freirean notions of conscientisation to the endeavour of understanding globalization.

Memorable Quotations

“The imagination is no longer a matter of individual genius, escapism from ordinary life, or just a dimension of aesthetics. It is a faculty that informs the daily lives of ordinary people in myriad ways: It allows people to consider migration, resist state violence, seek social redress, and design new forms of civic association and collaboration, often across national boundaries.” (6)

“One of the biggest disadvantages faced by activists working for the poor in for a such as the World Bank, the U.N. system, the WTO, NAFTA and GATT is their alienation from the vocabulary used by the university-policy nexus (and, in a different way, by corporate ideologues and strategists) to describe global problems, projects and policies. A strong effort to compare, describe and theorize “globalization from below” could help to close this gap.” (17)

“Hope is not just a mood or disposition; it is a socially and culturally sustained capacity, which can be systematically nurtured and redistributed.”

Local to Global Links

This article is unique in its focus on *academia* and *knowledge* as a local-global link, and is particularly important in the guidance it provides for the work of the Citizenship DRC. The act of examining local-global engagement will in part shape those links, according to the logic of Appadurai’s argument, particularly in relation to how democratic the research process itself is.

Reference 3 – Science, Knowledge and Policy

Backstrand, K (2004) “Scientisation vs. Civic Expertise in Environmental Governance: Ecofeminist, Eco-modern and Post-modern Responses.” *Environmental Politics*. 13(4): pp.695 – 714.

Main Point

In contrast to the traditional view of scientific advisors in which the science and policy domains are separated and science informs policy in a linear and sequential way, Backstrand conceives of the science-policy interplay as a hybrid activity in which the research and policy agendas are mutually constructed. Hence, scientific expertise is a hybrid of scientific judgement and perceptions of policy-makers’ needs. In this vein, the boundaries between the science and policy domain are fluid and constantly (re)negotiated. She embraces the idea of extended peer community, participatory scientific assessment and public participation and deliberation in the policy process in order to ensure quality assurance.

Overview

This article examines the role of science and technology in environmental decision-making and global environmental politics, diplomacy and governance. She attempts to capture the changing role of scientific expertise and conceptualize the link between science and policy in different environmental policy processes. The theoretical framework bridges, different approaches in constructivism, discourse analysis, science studies, international relations, environmental politics and green political theory.

The paper asks how scientific expertise is incorporated in environmental regimes and in multilateral environmental negotiations and diplomacy, and how it is transmitted in the networks of global governance entailing non-state actors such as the environmental civil society and scientific networks. The institutionalisation of scientific assessment in environmental diplomacy and in various United Nations and Convention-related bodies is a prominent feature. With the advent of global environmental diplomacy, multilateral scientific assessment is a major mechanism to provide scientific input for treaty making. As of today, international and scientific and technical advisory bodies are central in providing input for international environmental negotiations. The rise of ‘negotiated science’ is a prominent feature in ongoing diplomatic endeavours in climate change, air pollution, ozone depletion, biodiversity and desertification. The deliberative forums for scientific assessment are increasingly organised on a multi-national and multi-disciplinary basis. Neoliberal and regime-theoretical studies of global environmental politics primarily focus on how science effectively can assist in mitigating global environmental risks through diplomacy, regime-building and multilateral negotiations. Moving beyond the institutional, and managerial and organization issues linked to the role of science in international relations literature, she argues that the normative issues tied to the employment of scientific advisory are crucial.

Local to Global Links

Backstrand argues that there should be greater incorporation of local knowledge in international or global policy arenas and the science-policy nexus should be more participatory and engage local grassroots actors.

Reference 4 – Science, Knowledge and Policy

Fischer, Frank. 2000. *Citizens, Experts and the Environment: The Politics of Local Knowledge*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 1-31.

Main Point

There is a growing antagonism between citizens and experts in environmental policy making. He seeks to answer whether there is a way of circumventing a standoff between citizens and experts, citing the rising antagonism between the two groups manifest in issues such as genetically modified foods and creationism, suggesting that more public engagement, though not a panacea, is a promising solution.

Overview

Fischer focuses in this book on the complex challenges posed by environmental risk as a method for testing the contribution of citizen participation to science policy. He argues that while participatory democracy is not a panacea, it does hold the hope of bringing forth new knowledge and ideas capable of reshaping our understanding of existing interests and shaping new interests, conducting to new political pathways in the process. Local knowledge is not only useful, but essential, he says, in finding solutions to complex environmental risks. Furthermore, he argues that notions from contemporary studies of epistemology support the need to integrate both expert and lay knowledge. The solution to NIMBY problems is more, rather than less, democracy. Fischer explores in depth two experiences of participatory inquiry, popular epidemiology in the U.S. and participatory resource mapping in India.

Memorable Quotations

“The tension between professional expertise and democratic governance is an important political dimension of our time.”

Local to Global Links

Fisher argues that science and science-based policy-making at a global level must be grounded in local knowledge and expertise.

Reference 5 – Science, Knowledge and Policy

Fuller, Steve and Collier, James (2003). Philosophy, Rhetoric and the End of Knowledge: A New Beginning for Science and Technology Studies. Madison. University of Wisconsin P, xi-xxii.

Main Point

Science must become more accessible and participatory this can only be done through bottom up or external conceptions of policy problems and the creation of alternative language and epistemes.

Overview

Fuller distinguishes between what he calls the “High Church” and the “Low Church”: The “High Church” consists of philosophers, sociologists, and historians of science, who share a largely intellectual interest in the hold that science and scientific knowledge have over society. The “Low Church” consists of such heterogeneous groups as policymakers, feminists, journalists, and others with a concern for the problems that science has caused, has solved, and possibly can solve in modern society. In his attempts to make science more democratic, Fuller becomes somewhat of a spokesman for the “Low Church,” giving a voice to the nonscientist. He advocates and demonstrates the infusion of moral and political considerations into questions that had previously been confined to epistemology and the philosophy of science.

Local to Global Links

Many nonscientists are argued to be local grassroots actors and indigenous groups. Their participation in global knowledge/science dialogues is seen to be critical.

Reference 6 – Science, Knowledge and Policy

Jasanoff, S. and M. L. Martello (2004). Introduction: Globalization and Environmental Governance. [Earthly Politics: Local and Global in Environmental Governance](#). S. Jasanoff and M. L. Marteloo, MIT Press, 1-29.

Main Point

In the coming decades global governance will have to accommodate differences, even as it obliterates distance, and will have to respect many aspects of the local while developing institutions that transcend localism.

Overview

This volume analyzes a variety of approaches to environmental governance approaches that balance the local and the global in order to encourage new, more flexible frameworks of global governance. On the theoretical level, it draws on insights from the field of science and technology studies to enrich our understanding of environmental and development politics. On the pragmatic level, it discusses the design of institutions and processes to address problems of environmental governance that increasingly refuse to remain within national boundaries.

The cases in the book display the crucial relationship between knowledge and power--the links between the ways we understand environmental problems and the ways we manage them--and illustrate the different paths by which knowledge-power formations are arrived at, contested, defended, or set aside. By examining how local and global actors ranging from the World Bank to the Makah tribe in the Pacific Northwest respond to the contradictions of globalization, the authors identify some of the conditions for creating more effective engagement between the global and the local in environmental governance.

Memorable Quotations

“Global actors will have to tolerate, respect or even defer to many aspects of the local while crafting institutions that seek to avoid the risks and errors of rampant localism” (3)

“of greatest interest here, the reassertion of local knowledge claims and local identities against the simplifying and universalizing force of global science, technology and capital.” (4)

“Global solutions to environmental governance cannot realistically be contemplated without at the same time finding new opportunities for local self-expression”

“The construction of both the local and the global crucially depends on the production of knowledge and its interactions with power. How we understand and represent environmental problems is inescapable linked to the ways in which we choose to ameliorate or solve them. And which issues are defined as meriting the world’s attention has everything to do with who has power and resources, including scientific ones, to press for them.”

“Effective governance requires constant translation back and forth across relatively well-articulated global and local knowledge-power formations. This in turn calls for procedural innovation in science, politics, governance and the interactions among them.

Local to Global Links

The authors analyze the ways in which local and global dynamics interact. They stress the relevance of science and knowledge, as well as emphasise the need to include the local in any analysis of global environmental problems.

Reference 7 – Science, Knowledge and Policy

Leach, M. and I. Scoones (2005) Mobilizing Citizens: social movements and the politics of knowledge. Citizenship DRC Synthesis Paper, DRAFT - November 2005. 1-25.

Main Point

In order to understand new forms of citizenship it is critical to understand the politics of knowledge in mobilization and social movement theory.

Overview

This paper is a comparative reflection on a number of recent cases of citizen mobilisation in both north and south. These case studies have asked: who mobilises and who does not, and why? What are the patterns of experience, profiles and identities of activists? How are activist networks constituted, and what diverse forms do they take? What forms of identity, representation and processes of inclusion and exclusion are involved? What forms of knowledge – including values, perceptions and experiences - frame these public engagements and movements? Within what spaces do debates take place, and what resources are drawn upon? How do citizens and ‘experts’ of various kinds interact in processes of mobilisation? This paper offers a synthesis of some of the major theoretical perspectives, lines of argument and issues emerging from the different ways the case studies have addressed and answered these questions.

The first part of the paper offers a brief summary of theories of social movements, drawing out four overlapping perspectives on processes of mobilisation. Engaging social movement theory with theories of citizenship, we show how each perspective highlights different dimensions of citizenship. Understanding the mobilisation processes in the case studies, we suggest, requires a combination of perspectives. This points towards an understanding of ‘mobilising citizens’ as knowledgeable actors engaged in a dynamic, networked politics, which involves shifting and temporary forms of social solidarity and identification through processes that are sometimes local or national but sometimes involve networks that span local sites across the world.

In particular, three key themes emerge from the cases which the second part of the paper explores in more detail. These in turn require the linking of further areas of literature with theories of social movement and citizenship to encompass a fuller understanding of the on-the-ground dynamics of mobilisation in the contemporary world. First, the theme of knowledge and power emerges as key, raising issues of how the politics of knowledge affect the framing and dynamics of mobilisation. Literatures on constructivist perspectives in science and technology studies help illuminate the processes involved. Second, the theme of cultures, styles and practices of activism is highlighted, raising questions of how solidarities are formed and maintained. Literatures on social practice and performance enrich social movement theory in helping to comprehend these processes. A third theme highlights the increasing array and complexity of arenas in which citizens press their claims across local and global sites. Legal arenas for the pressing of rights claims amidst these other processes emerge as particularly significant, and literatures on legal pluralism and legal anthropology provide important insights; important too are media and internet spaces, where literatures from media and cyber-studies can enrich social movement theory.

In conclusion, the paper demonstrates the need to expand and enrich debates about social movements from a diversity of literatures if contemporary processes of mobilisation and their implications for citizenship are to be understood. It argues that today’s dynamics of public controversy, debates about risk, and the forms of mobilisation and protest arising requires putting the politics of knowledge centre-stage in our attempts to recast democratic theory and notions of citizenship. The politics of knowledge become even more pertinent when encountering the interconnected and often globalised mobilisation networks around contemporary issues. However the diversity of case studies highlights that emergent patterns are far from uniform. Mobilisation processes emerge from and remain strongly shaped by political histories and cultures; both of citizens

and of the public and private institutions they encounter. In particular, the conclusion highlights the dynamic tension between more collective forms of solidarity and citizenship identity, and more individualised forms of ‘responsible citizen’ emerging amidst cultures of neo-liberalism.

Memorable Quotations

“This appreciation of knowledge-politics needs to go hand-in-hand with the notions of citizen agency which have underlain both recent developments in social movement theory, and in theories of citizenship (Nyamu 2005). The result is a notion of mobilising citizens as creative, knowledgeable actors engaged in political processes, which involve contestations between knowledge claims linked respectively to particular political and social commitments and cultures. In short, contentious politics today is more often than not the politics of knowledge.” (18)

Local to Global Links

Emerging networks that span local sites across the world are increasingly influencing global forces and contributing to global knowledge flows. In turn global forces are influence the identity and formation of these groups.

Rights, Discourse and Identity

A turn in the anthropological understanding of culture has led to a shift in the discipline's approach to the issues of rights, discourse and identity from ethnography to multi-site studies that examine the impact of large-scale, transnational processes on communities, seeking to understand the complex articulatory mechanisms between the global and the local. This new focus caused the field, which once abhorred any universal notion of rights, to reconsider its position on the long-standing dichotomy between universal and local values. Consequently, the anthropology of human rights and citizenship has been a growing field of anthropological enquiry over the last decade. These philosophical dimensions are explained concisely in the introduction by R. Ashby Wilson.

Central to this new line of enquiry has been an understanding of human rights as the discourse of an emerging global culture that constructs identities and forges forms of social relations. In this sense, Jane Cowan et al. warn, rights must be understood to be both "enabling and constraining." By claiming a right, the individual or group must accept the roles and identities inherent therein.

Other anthropologists, particularly those in the areas of legal anthropology and legal pluralism, point to greater agency than Cowan and others suggest. Sally Engle Merry argues that the concept of human rights, though based on Western liberal-democratic ideals, gets reinterpreted in a process of local incorporation she terms 'legal vernacularisation'. In this school of thought, Celestine Nyamu-Musembi focuses on the global forces in local context, underscoring how global advocates of human rights have ignored potential opportunities to construct equity upon local notions of fairness and justice.

The nexus between all these forces is perhaps best captured by the work by Saskia Sassen, who coined the term "glocal" to describe the networks and associations set up by migrants that in essence "denationalize" spaces and open opportunities for non-state actors, creating global cities that are the hubs of economic and political globalization.

Overall, these works points largely to the cultural or ideational dimension of local-global citizen engagement. By and large, these theories and case studies demonstrate that global discourses and local values, beliefs and customs interact in complex ways that can be transformative.

Main Questions

- When does transnationalism reduce or enhance people's ability to imagine other livelihoods and political relations?
- Does globalization necessarily lead to the end of history and the homogenization of culture?
- How to reconcile local institutions with universal human rights?

References Abstracted

Ashby Wilson, R. and J. P. Mitchell (2003). Introduction: the social life of rights. Human Rights in Global Perspective: Anthropological studies of rights, claims and entitlements. R. Ashby Wilson and J. P. Mitchell. London, Routledge, 1-15.

Bickham Mendez, J. (2002). "Gender and Citizenship in a Global Context: The Struggle for Maquila Workers' Rights in Nicaragua." Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power, 9: pp. 7-38.

Cowan, J., Dembour, M.-B. and Wilson, R. (2001). Introduction. Culture and Rights: Anthropological Perspectives. J. Cowan, M.-B. Dembour and R. Wilson. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1-25.

- Merry, S. E. (1992). "Anthropology, Law, and Transnational Processes." *Annual Reviews* 21: pp. 357-379.
- Nyamu-Musembi (2003). "Local norms, institutions, and women's property rights in rural Kenya." *East African Journal of Peace & Human Rights* 9, 255-285.
- Sassen, S. (2002). Global cities and Diasporic Networks: Microsites in Global Civil Society. *Global Civil Society*. H. Anheier, M. Glasius and M. Kaldor. Oxford, Oxford University Press: pp. 217-238.

Reference 1 – Rights, Discourse and Identity

Ashby Wilson, R. and J. P. Mitchell (2003). Introduction: the social life of rights. Human Rights in Global Perspective: Anthropological studies of rights, claims and entitlements. R. Ashby Wilson and J. P. Mitchell. London, Routledge, 1-15.

Main Point

This book aims to understand the consequences of the recent rise of rights talk and rights institutions in both global and local politics. It brings together papers from the conference “Rights, Claims and Entitlements,” held by the Association of Social Anthropologists of Great Britain and the Commonwealth (ASA), held at the University of Sussex in April 2001.

Overview

The book departs from the perspective of the anthropological study of everyday legal process, understanding legal systems or legal cultures as products of social practices. This perspective, the introduction explains, emerged with the work of Clifford Geertz and has since been combined with Foucauldian approaches to legal discourse. The book is thus a collection of case studies that stress human sociality as opposed to the foundations for human rights found in conventional liberal accounts. The authors recognize, however, that one of the great challenges in forging an understanding of rights from this perspective is avoiding a ‘radical populism of simply reinforcing what informants say about justice, rights and political claims.’

Memorable Quotations

“New debates on power, globalization and transnationalism seem to have displaced the terms of the relativist-universalist polarity. The discussion has been reframed in terms of interconnections, networks and movements of people, ideas and things rather than static and discrete cultures in conflict. Nevertheless, the problem remains of how to steer a path between the rarefied and decontextualised ethics of neo-Kantian political philosophers such as Gewirth (1978) and the radical populism of simply reinforcing what informants say about justice, rights and political claims.”

Local to Global Links

This chapter summarizes the evolution of theoretical perspectives on rights and culture in anthropology from the relativist-universalist dichotomy to a more nuanced perspective on how the international spread of rights and legal systems provide a discursive forum for contesting values and shaping local and global realities.

Reference 2 – Rights, Discourse and Identity

Bickham Mendez, J. (2002). "Gender and Citizenship in a Global Context: The Struggle for Maquila Workers' Rights in Nicaragua." *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power*, 9: pp. 7-38.

Main Point

This article examines how the global discourse of rights and citizenship is applied by a Nicaraguan women's association struggling for better working conditions in a Free Trade Zone. The paper demonstrates how local movements are in fact able to deploy global discourses in unique and tailored ways, though the hegemonic power of the state continues to constrain such strategies.

Overview

"This article analyzes the strategic deployment of rights and citizenship discourses by a Nicaraguan women's organization (MEC) and the struggle that this group has faced in reconciling the use of these discourses with its aim of bringing about changes in the conditions faced by women workers in the Free Trade Zone (FTZ). Contestations regarding notions of citizenship are explored, and I discuss Nicaraguan state agents' and (to a lesser degree) Maquila factory owners' use of notions of citizenship, and how they both coincide and conflict with neoliberal social and economic projects. The case of this Nicaraguan organization's discursive engagement with state actors sheds light on the question: How do ideologies linked to transnational social movements filter into regional and national discourses and become transformed by local actors? In addition, this case has important implications for the larger issue of changing state sovereignty within a global context. A contextualized approach to the strategic use of (human) rights and citizenship calls attention to the complex and context-specific dilemmas and opportunities involved in adapting this "frame" to work for oppositional objectives. Furthermore, viewing rights and citizenship as always situational calls us to move away from narrow conceptualizations of structural transformation to a more complex and nuanced vision."

Memorable Quotations

"While human rights discourse offers women's groups a powerful tool that lends international legitimacy to political demands, the challenge facing these groups is to transform the human rights agenda to include women, that is, to make human rights truly women's rights." (18)

"Thus, the ways in which rights and notions of citizenship are framed is dependent upon a specific national or local context; a reminder that despite globalization a diversity of normative orders prevail. Though the language of rights is part of a globalised discourse, the ways in which it is interpreted and contested is contingent upon particular local circumstances." (33)

Local-Global Links

The case study and theoretical discussion of this paper underscores three important points: 1) how seemingly local conflicts may in fact be global in nature, involving transnational capital and global discourses in this case, 2) how globalization has not eroded the power of the state, and 3) the importance of understanding how global discourse is translated into local contexts.

Reference 3 – Rights, Discourse and Identity

Cowan, J., Dembour, M.-B. and Wilson, R. (2001). Introduction. Culture and Rights: Anthropological Perspectives. J. Cowan, M.-B. Dembour and R. Wilson. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1-25.

Main Point

Cowan et al. identify three ways rights and culture have been conjoined in recent years; rights versus culture, rights to culture, rights as culture and proposes a fourth way for understanding the relationship between the two notions by using culture as analytical lens to understand rights.

Overview

Positioning rights against culture, as anthropologists initially did, casts the two notions as diametrically opposed, emphasizing the inability to reach common ground. Various actors have since adopted this discourse to resist the pressures of human rights. The arguments of Islamic states, for instance, have sought to justify their practices in these terms. Rights to culture refers to how “the human rights discourse has stretched to allow culture to become an object of rights claims”. Indeed, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Persons Belonging to Ethnic or National, Linguistic and Religious Minorities and Article 27 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights demonstrate how an individual’s right to his or her traditional customs have become enshrined in international human rights covenants. The final way in which rights and culture have interacted, according to the authors, is in the capacity that rights have acted as a culture. Anthropologists have begun to interpret human rights as the discourse of an emerging global culture that constructs identities and forges forms of social relations. In this sense, they warn, rights must be understood to be both “enabling and constraining.” By claiming a right, the individual or group must accept the roles and identities inherent therein. With this far more detached perspective, anthropology has sought to examine human rights as a new narrative, replacing the grand narratives that predominated during the Cold War.

Memorable Quotations

“The tension goes beyond the human rights discourse to pervade legal discourse in many of its conceptions, particularly Western positive law and Islamic law. This is because a universal status is claimed for legal rules by legal officials. As it is usually grounded in a positivist view of truth, law essentializes social categories and identities. However, it never completely eradicates the complexity of social facts, which present themselves in the courtroom, in the legislative arena and in political struggles.” (6)

“The human rights discourse has stretched to allow culture to become an object of rights claims” (8)

“Group rights has returned to the agenda, involving re-theorizations such as ‘the rights of peoples’, particularly as a response to concerns about, and mobilizations by, ‘indigenous peoples. Such developments signal a significant historical shift.’” (9)

“Invocations of culture have seemingly become inseparable from the language of resistance. However, the political implications of such claims cannot be generalized because culture may be called upon to legitimize reactionary projects as easily as progressive ones” (10)

Local-Global Links

This position recognizes that culture is increasingly globalised and open to influence from migration, trade, the media and other international forces. Thus how communities themselves adopt, transform and utilize the discourse of human rights has become an object of interest.

Reference 4 – Rights, Discourse and Identity

Merry, S. E. (1992). "Anthropology, Law, and Transnational Processes." *Annual Reviews* 21: pp. 357-379.

Main Point

Merry explains how anthropology has come to understand the process she term 'legal vernacularisation,' a process by which human rights are reinterpreted and transformed through the engagement of local understanding with global discourses.

Overview

National and international contexts are increasingly important to researchers for understanding local situations, particularly in the capacity that the laws of nation-states and international regulations have penetrated and shaped local social arenas. Legal pluralism has traditionally sought to elucidate the co-existence of multiple systems of legal authority, but only recently has the field begun to explore the interactions between different systems. Merry makes the case in this seminal article for moving the field even further with a focus on this process within a transnational context through the lens of culture and power. She reviews the anthropological literature on the topic since 1975, highlighting the major shifts inspired by the work of Clifford Geertz and Michel Foucault in particular to incorporate ideas of culture, power, language and discourse into our understanding of legal systems.

Memorable Quotations

"The analysis of relations among normative orders as mutually constitutive provides a framework for examining the relationship between dominant and subordinate groups or classes in situations of legal pluralism. It offers a way of thinking about the possibilities of domination through law and of the limits to this domination, pointing to areas in which individuals and groups can and do resist." (372)

Local to Global Links

Merry elaborates on how a crucial form of local-global engagement occurs in the two-way process of citizens reconciling global discourses with local contexts.

Reference 5 – Rights, Discourse and Identity

Nyamu-Musembi (2003). "Local norms, institutions, and women's property rights in rural Kenya." *East African Journal of Peace & Human Rights* 9, 255-285.

Main Point

Nyamu-Musembi uses the anthropological perspectives on legal pluralism described above to critique the abolitionist stance against cultural practices that contravene human rights and to make a more normative argument for how the process of legal vernacularization can be used to build social justice.

Overview

Nyamu-Musembi argues against approaches to gender equality that take an abolitionist stance against cultural practices that contravene human rights principles. This approach assumes that local practices can never contribute to the realization of women's human rights. She argues that this presumption neglects the role the state plays in shaping local custom, taking the view that formal institutions and local custom are necessarily adversarial. Secondly, she points out that the presumption prevents an honest appreciation for potential opportunities within local notions of fairness and justice, a process that Sally Engle Merry has called the 'vernacularization' of human rights. Nyami-Musembi describes how clans, forums for information dispute resolution before local administrators, and the quasi-traditional Land Adjudication Committees in Easter Kenya provide both affordability and accessibility to women. Furthermore, local customs are constantly in flux and subject to change by human agency. Finally, she suggests that some claims around access to and control of property are acknowledged in local practice that would not be recognized in formal law.

Memorable Quotations

"In conclusion, a genuine engagement with practice at the local level is powerful in dislodging both the abolitionist dismissal of the local as 'the repository of unchanging patriarchal values' and the defensive relativist portrayal of local norms as bounded and immutable. Analysis reveals that in neither the national nor the local normative order is gender equality fully articulated, thus necessitating reforms that are comprehensive rather than simply an instrumental deployment of national norms to reform the local sphere." (289)

Local to Global Links

Nyamu-Musembi's case study demonstrates how global and local forces might conjoin through a process of interpretation and translation, in this case, to produce greater social justice for women, offering lessons for perhaps a more democratic struggle for rights, locally and globally.

Reference 6 – Rights, Discourse and Identity

Sassen, S. (2002). Global cities and Diasporic Networks: Microsites in Global Civil Society. *Global Civil Society*. H. Anheier, M. Glasius and M. Kaldor. Oxford, Oxford University Press: pp. 217-238.

Main Point

Influential work by Saskia Sassen celebrates the agency of migrants who set up global or ‘glocal’ sociopolitical networks and associations, pointing to how the “national” as container of social process and power has been cracked.

Overview

Sassen seeks to bring “place” back into the discussion on globalization with a focus on the city. She points out that economic globalization has mostly been conceptualized in terms of the tensions between the national and the global. Additionally, place is typically seen to be neutralized by the capacity for global communications. However, Sassen argues that global cities can be seen as ‘microsites’ of global civil society where, thanks to ‘new network technologies’, transnational diasporic networks of migrants and asylum-seekers are able to form and flourish. Indeed, she points out that migrants are becoming new political subjects because of their increased activism. Examples of transnational political migrant actors are given (such as the African Service Committee or the Iranian Refugees’ Alliance) as evidence that national paradigms of citizenship are thus somehow outmoded. Indeed, her argument here links up with that of James Holston and Arjun Appadurai in an article on cities and citizenship, where they argue that since formal citizenship does not necessarily lead to substantive rights, and can in fact create extra unwelcome burdens (citizenship duties), it is not surprising that immigrants are increasingly adopting more transnational modes of citizenship, reflected by a greater interest in the affairs of the originating country than those of the new society.

Memorable Quotations

“The weakening of the exclusive authority of states over national territory facilitates the ascendancy of sub- and transnational spaces and actors in politico-civic processes” (217)

“The national as container of social process and power is cracked. This cracked casing opens up a geography of politics and civics that links subnational spaces. Cities are foremost in this new geography. The density of political and civic cultures in large cities localises global civil society in people’s lives.”

Local-Global Links

Sassen’s work points to two important elements of the changing nature of citizen engagement. First, there is a denationalizing of specific types of national settings, particularly global cities. Secondly, the formation of conceptual and operational openings for actors other than the national state in cross-border political dynamics.

Annex I

Supplemental Literature Review on Local-Global Citizen Engagement

Project convenors:

John Gaventa

Institute of Development Studies

Rajesh Tandon

Society for Participatory Research in Asia

Prepared by Greg Barrett

March 2009

Preface

This document was commissioned to provide an updated view on some of the most recently published research relevant to the research agenda of the Local-Global Citizen Engagements Working Group of the Citizenship DRC. It is less detailed than the preceding *Literature Review on Local-Global Citizen Engagement* (2006) and is meant to function as a ‘snapshot’ of the evolving debates in the literature since that time.

The literature contained herein conforms, broadly speaking, to the six previously identified bodies of literature pertaining to the current global governance debates. These were as follows:

- Global Citizenship
- Global Governance and Accountability
- Global Civil Society
- Global Advocacy and Social Movements
- Science, Knowledge and Policy
- Rights, Discourse and Identity

Each publication is briefly summarised with reference details, an overview/abstract and a handful of key ideas or quotations from the research.

Publications were found using a semi-systematic selection process that included keyword searches in ISI Web of Knowledge, keyword searches on the electronic library of the British Library of Development Studies and a review of the materials published by leading research centres on global governance. The literature contained herein represents (a) publications from 2005 onward, and (b) publications from English-language journals and institutions, and as a result, is far from exhaustive. A research assistant from the Institute of Development Studies, Greg Barrett, contributed to this review under the guidance of John Gaventa.

Reference 6 – Global Citizenship

Archibugi, D (2008) *The Global Commonwealth of Citizens: Toward Cosmopolitan Democracy*. Princeton University Press: Princeton, NJ.

Overview

The author examines the potential for cosmopolitan democracy as the most effective system of governance against the backdrop of globalization. Archibugi argues that – despite the spread of democracy in recent years – the challenges of globalization require a form of democratic governance beyond traditional nation-state norms. Broadly speaking, he proposes that international institutions (particularly the UN) be reformed and that voices from social movements, cultural communities and minorities be strengthened.

Useful ideas and/or quotations

- 1) The concept of ‘democratic schizophrenia’ – ‘The West has often declared its intention to promote democracy in other people’s back yard but is by no means willing to share the management of global affairs with others’ (6). I thought this concept could be potentially useful, which Archibugi develops further into a criticism of the complacency of mature democracies ‘to define democracy as good but also defin[e] what democracies do as good’ (6).
- 2) The five areas highlighted by the author as priorities for ‘whatever form of transnational democracy is adopted’ are: (a) control over the use of force; (b) acceptance of cultural diversity; (c) strengthening the self-determination of peoples; (d) monitoring internal affairs (primarily concerned with the protection of human rights); (e) participatory management of global problems (ie, management of the global commons’ (88-9).
- 3) The author outlines the distinctive features of three possible models for a cosmopolitan project – (a) confederal; (b) federalist and (c) cosmopolitan democracy (see 101-12).
- 4) A contract of citizenship characterised by basic rights and minimum duties opens up the way to a global commonwealth of citizens, which could take thicker forms of certain groups of persons in conditions of extreme need. Groups of persons deprived of their national citizenship rights could find protection in a more comprehensive world citizenship in which the institutions in charge perform several administrative functions...’ (118).
- 5) Archibugi (here and elsewhere) puts forward a framework for developing a World Parliamentary Assembly at the UN, elected as representatives of the peoples of the world rather than their governments. He proposes a number of options for enabling this to occur (see Chapter 6).

Reference 7 – Global Citizenship

Schattle, H (2008) *The Practices of Global Citizenship*. Rowman & Littlefield: Lanham, MD.

Overview

The author explores the changing meanings and expressions of global citizenship and discusses its current manifestations by interviewing self-identified ‘global citizens’ from a variety of backgrounds and in a number of contexts. The author also reviews the literature and popular press to trace the characterization of ‘global citizenship’ over time (largely concentrated on publications from the 1990s onward).

Useful ideas and/or quotations

While the author acknowledges the ongoing primacy of national citizenship as a principal – ‘but not exclusive’ – basis of political membership and allegiance, nonetheless forms of global citizenship are flourishing. ‘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... Indeed.... The term “global citizenship” is often used as a lever in public debate to evaluate the actions and policies of nation-states’ (3).

- 1) For many of today’s self-described global citizens, the popular adage “think globally, act locally” has evolved into something more comprehensive: “Think and act locally and globally” (3).
- 2) ‘...[M]any patriots of global citizenship who were interviewed for this study seemed to associate global citizenship with tangible and meaningful life experiences within face-to-face communities’, which challenges the notion that everyday people might not be capable of engaging with global citizenship because of its abstract academic and philosophical tendencies (24-5).
- 3) Global citizens interviewed by the author identified, broadly, three primary concepts of global citizenship – (a) awareness; (b) responsibility and (c) participation. Beyond these, a number of secondary concepts underpinning global citizens’ identity emerged, including (d) cross-cultural empathy; (e) personal achievement and (f) international mobility.
- 4) **The author claims that global citizenship carries a ‘distinctly local flavour’ among civil society groups** – ‘...[T]he activists and organisations [interviewed] show how agendas related to global citizenship aim not only to *widen* public space from domestic politics and society into the international arena but also to *deepen* public space, often within local communities, by bringing together individuals and groups from a variety of ethnic cultural and religious backgrounds in hopes of fostering mutual dialogue, understanding and respect’ (90-1; author’s emphasis).
- 5) ‘The practices of global citizenship often thrive within the most immediate of public spaces, especially if global citizenship for many individuals means self-awareness, principled decision making and engagement across cultures’ (163).

Reference 9 – Global Governance and Accountability

Dingwerth, K & P Pattberg (2006) 'Global Governance as a Perspective on World Politics', *Global Governance* 12: 185-203.

Overview

The authors are concerned with the diverse conceptualizations – which they think have proliferated recently – of ‘global governance’. While they appreciate some flexibility in interpretation, they argue that a more precise use of the term is critical to developing more coherent theories. They review the uses of the term in the literature and then outline their use of it as an analytical concept that provides a perspective on current global processes outside the more traditional notion of ‘international relations’.

Useful ideas and/or quotations

- 1) ‘In contrast to most theorizing about international relations, the notion of global governance attaches equal importance to nongovernmental organisations (NGOs), transnational corporations (TNCs) and scientific actors’ (191). This gives us a ‘multiactor perspective on world politics’ (191).
- 2) ‘Global governance is... particularly interested in the interlinkages between the different policy levels’, and not simply international interaction amongst states (192).
- 3) ‘In a domestic context, governance refers to horizontal process of self-coordination—for instance, in issue networks, advocacy coalitions or similar mechanisms—that alter the relation between public and private interests. Transferred to the international and transnational policy level, where central authority is largely absent, governance accordingly encompasses intergovernmental negotiations as well as other, less formal processes of coordination among a number of public and private actors’ (192-93).

Reference 10 – Global Governance and Accountability

Berger, MT (2006) 'Beyond Nation-Building to State-Building: The Geopolitics of Development, the Nation-State System and the Changing Global Order', *Third World Quarterly* 27(1): 5-25.

Overview

Like a number of articles appearing since 2005, the author puts the international nation-building effort in the wake of the second Iraq war in perspective. The approach here is historical, with an outline on previous 'successes' and 'failures' and an analysis of the utility of nation- (or even state-building) given the current changes in the nation-state system.

Useful ideas and/or quotations

- 1) '...[I]t is more important than ever to set the idea and practice of nation-building in the context of the world-historical shift from exhausted colonialism and decolonisation to exhausted internationalism and globalization, global changes which have been central to the universalisation and transformation of the nation-state system over the past 50 years or so' (7).
- 2) Despite some in-roads made by a handful of academics, 'the most influential academic narratives on nation-building and international security in the post-cold war era continue to avoid or downplay issues of history, culture and identity, in favour of a quantitative and technocratic approach' (13). This is a direct critical reference to the work of Collier on fragile states and conflict.
- 3) 'State formation and nation-building need to be set in the context of the history of the universalisation of the nation-state system and the way in which the subsequent spread of globalization has, in an increasingly uneven and incomplete fashion, pushed nation-states in many parts of the world to the limits of their potential as a vehicle for security and development' (14).

Reference 11 – Global Governance and Accountability

Buchanan, A & RO Keohane (2006) 'The Legitimacy of Global Governance Institutions', *Ethics & International Affairs* 20(4): 405-37.

Overview

The authors attempt to articulate a global public standard 'for the normative legitimacy of global governance institutions' (405). This, they claim, can pave the way for principled criticism of these institutions and could better guide efforts to reform them. They forge an interpretation of 'legitimacy' somewhere between (a) 'an increasingly discredited conception of legitimacy' that is conflated with international legality, understood as state consent, and (b) 'the unrealistic view that legitimacy for these institutions requires the same democratic standards we normally apply to states' (405-06).

Useful points and/or quotations

- 1) 'It is important not only that global governance institutions be legitimate, but that they are perceived to be legitimate. The perception of legitimacy matters, because, in a democratic era, multilateral institutions will only thrive if they are viewed as legitimate by democratic publics' (407).
- 2) 'The practice of making legitimacy judgments,' of global governance institutions, 'is grounded in a complex belief—namely, that while it is true that institutions ought to meet standards more demanding than mere mutual benefit (relative to some relevant noninstitutional alternative), they can be worthy of our support even if they do not maximally serve our interests and even if they do not measure up to our highest moral standard' (410).
- 3) Regarding the false equivalence of legitimacy and justice: 'There are two reasons not to insist that only just institutions have the right to rule. First, there is sufficient disagreement on what justice requires that such a standard for legitimacy would thwart the eminently reasonable goal of securing coordinated support for valuable institutions on the basis of moral reasons' (412). The second reason – as mentioned previously – is that justice deficits in international institutions are not remedied by pulling support from those institutions, but rather require engagement with reforms and processes that can build more effective institutions.
- 4) 'The problem is that for a modern state to function, much of what state agents do will not be subject to democratic decisions, and saying that the public has consented in some highly general way to whatever it is that state agents do is clearly inadequate. **The difficulty is not in identifying chains of delegation stretching from the individual citizen to state agents, but rather that at some point the impact of the popular will on how political power is used becomes so attenuated as to be merely nominal'** (414; research assistant's emphasis).
- 5) '...[T]here is at present no global public—no worldwide political community constituted by a broad consensus recognizing a common domain as the proper subject of global collective decision-making and habitually communicating with one another about public issues. Nor is there consensus on a normative framework within which to deliberate together about a global common interest' (416).

Reference 8 – Global Civil Society

Nanz, P & J Steffek (2005) Global Governance, Participation and the Public Sphere, in D Held & M Koenig-Archibugi (eds) *Global Governance and Accountability*. Blackwell: Malden, MA.

Overview

The authors explore the analytical and normative dimensions of democratic and legitimate decision-making at the global level, using the lens of a deliberative theory of politics. From their analysis, the democratic legitimacy of a system of global governance requires the creation of a transnational public sphere offering opportunities for deliberative participation outside traditional national frameworks. The authors posit that civil society offers the best possibility for facilitating deliberation in a global public sphere and present a brief exploratory case study of the WTO and procedural reforms that could increase transparency and its cooperation with civil society organisations.

Useful ideas and/or quotations

- 1) ‘Separating the process of rule-making from politically accountable institutions, global governance is argued to suffer a massive “democratic deficit”’ (190).
- 2) ‘What is important to the notion of public deliberation is not so much that everyone participates but more that there is a warranted presumption that public opinion is formed on the basis of adequate information and relevant reasons, and that those whose interests are involved have an equal and effective opportunity to make their own interests (and their reasons for them) known’ (197). The authors, citing Habermas (1996: 360), claim that the ‘public use of reason’ is dependant on an active civil society participating in organised public spheres (197); ‘organised civil society has a high potential to act as a “transmission belt” between deliberative processes within international organisations and emerging transnational public spheres’ (199).
- 3) The authors suggest that – at the global level – social actors (‘national officials, scientific experts, NGOs, etc.’) are best placed to address problems in deliberative fora. However, this is to some degree contingent on space for local and national levels of deliberation that help push upward concerns to the global level of deliberation.

Reference 9 – Global Civil Society

Collingwood, V & L Logister (2005) ‘State of the Art: Addressing the INGO “Legitimacy Deficit”’, *Political Studies Review* 3(2): 175-92.

Overview

The authors examine the treatment of INGOs and legitimacy in the literature and determine two broadly defined approaches – (a) normative work on global governance and the importance of INGOs to that system versus (b) more policy oriented work, concerned primarily with concrete problems arising from INGOs’ work in the development process.

Useful ideas and/or quotations

- 1) INGOs and ‘legitimacy’ – ‘The whole notion of what constitutes a “legitimate international order is currently in flux, as significant gaps emerge between liberal democratic ideals and the reality of power distribution... New norms, such as the right to democratic participation, are emerging to take sovereignty-as-control’s place, competing to bestow “legitimacy” on regimes’ (180).
- 2) ‘The very diversity of INGO movements is thus both the strength and the weakness of a global citizen order: how can consensus be reached with a multitude of voices, speaking for different interests?’ (183).
- 3) ‘Collaboration,’ with institutional donors, ‘has double-edged implications for INGOs’ legitimacy. On the one hand, NGOs working hand-in-hand with government agencies benefit from funding and prestige that this contact brings, potentially extending their influence in policy circles. On the other hand, accepting extensive government funding can dent independence and create dependency’ (187).
- 4) ‘A further pressing question is the extent to which it is feasible to expect INGOs to operate democratically. Again, drawing an analogy between states and INGOs is not necessarily useful. While INGOs cannot currently claim to be representative of the common good, neither are they *responsible* for it, unlike states?’ (188; author’s emphasis).

Reference 10 – Global Civil Society

Sending, OJ & IB Neumann (2006) ‘Governance to Governmentality: Analysing NGOs, States and Power’, *International Studies Quarterly* 50(3): 651-72.

Overview

The authors claim the assertions in the global governance literature that the state has lost power to nonstate actors and that political authority has been ceded to supra- or international institutional spheres. From their perspective, the role of nonstate actors in the current global system is not indicative of a transfer of power but instead a changing logic of government. In this context, civil society ‘is redefined from a passive object of government... into an entity that is both an object *and* a subject of government’ (651; authors’ emphasis).

Useful ideas and/or quotations

- 1) ‘...[S]tudies of global governance have a zero-sum conception of power where an increase in the power and influence of nonstate actors is *ipso facto* defined as a simultaneous reduction in state power and authority’ (652).
- 2) ‘While studies of global governance excel in charting the diffusion and disaggregation of authority from the state to nonstate actors, they fail in exploring both the power at work in the actual practices through which governance takes place, as well as the more specific content or logic of the relations between state and nonstate actors. The extent to which nonstate actors are directly funded by and actively encouraged by states to be engaged in processes of global governance is inadequately addressed’ (654).
- 3) The authors use two case studies – international family planning and land mine eradication – in a pretty interesting way to illustrate their point (ie, ‘political power operates *through* rather than *on* civil society’) (669; authors’ emphases).

Reference 11 – Global Civil Society

Seckinelgin, H (2006) 'The Multiple Worlds of NGOs and HIV/AIDS: Rethinking NGOs and Their Agency,' *Journal of International Development* 18(5): 715-27.

Overview

The author gives an overview of the increased recognition of NGOs as policy actors, particularly in the HIV/AIDS field in developing countries. The author focuses on the under-theorised conception of NGOs' 'agency' in this context. The paper discusses the theoretical assumptions underpinning NGO agency within the HIV/AIDS policy context and examines the limits to NGO agency within 'the larger socio-cultural institutionalization processes which construct NGOs as relevant actors' (716).

Useful ideas and/or quotations

- 1) 'A focus on NGO management and organizational issues, as important as these may be, has obscured understanding of the institutional location of NGOs within a larger socio-political and cultural context' (716).
- 2) 'The analysis of NGO capabilities needs to be located within social processes implicit in multiple institutionalized settings that differently frame NGO identity and agency' (720). The author proposes an analysis of 'agency' (within this context – NGOs in the HIV/AIDS field) within two domains – (a) the framework of international policy and (b) the target community perspective.
- 3) 'By becoming actors for service delivery, NGOs locate themselves into a set of social relations that are institutionalized at the international level. NGOs are exposed to "capacity building" exercises by donors who try to ensure that with "right" management tools are put in place to help achieve international policy targets' (724). This, the author argues, might benefit NGOs to the degree that they can access international actors, but it also carries the possibility of frustrating NGOs' responses to the needs of local people.
- 4) '...[C]onsidering that NGOs are institutionalized in various socio-political contexts at the same time, a response to the question of *who considers what is success and failure in their activities* (people or international actors) is central' (724; author's emphasis).

Reference 12 – Global Civil Society

Castells, M (2008) ‘The New Public Sphere: Global Civil Society, Communication Networks and Global Governance’, *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 616: 78-93.

Overview

Castells explores the relationships between government and civil society via their interaction in the public sphere (‘the space of communication of ideas and projects that emerge from society...’ p.78). This public sphere has shifted from the national to the global and, as a result, a new form of ‘public diplomacy’ (of the public, not of the government) takes place in this global public sphere and impacts more traditional forms of official diplomacy and national power relationships.

Useful ideas and/or quotations

- 1) The majority of this paper gives a relatively familiar description of the ongoing changes to the notions of ‘public sphere’, ‘global civil society’ and ‘global governance’. However, I found Castells’ notion of a global form of ‘public diplomacy’ (of the public, not of the government) – towards the paper’s end – a potentially useful concept for the ‘seeing like a citizen’ approach and the exploration of how networked citizen engagement shapes decision-making landscapes.
- 2) On the new public sphere: “The new political system in a globalized world emerges from the processes of the formation of a global civil society and a global network state that supersedes and integrates the preexisting nation-states without dissolving them into a global government. **There is a process of the emergence of de facto global governance without a global government**” (89; research assistant’s emphasis).
- 3) “The goal of public diplomacy, in contrast to government diplomacy, is not to assert power or to negotiate a rearrangement of power relationships. It is to induce a communication space in which a new, common language could emerge as a precondition for diplomacy, so that when the time for diplomacy comes, it reflects not only interests and power making but also meaning and sharing” (91).

Reference 8 – Global Advocacy and Social Movements

Hintjens, H (2006) 'Appreciating the Movement of the Movements', *Development in Practice* 16(6): 628-43.

Overview

This review essay surveys the insights from the growing body of literature on the 'Global Justice and Solidarity Movement' (aka the Anti-Globalization Movement, or 'the Movement of the Movements') in order to understand its nature as it operates across local, national and global boundaries. The author explores this movement's capacity to represent effectively millions worldwide by reviewing participants' self-described aims and the scholarly theories about participation emerging in the literature.

Useful ideas and/or quotations

- 1) 'It is often obvious what the Global Justice and Solidarity Movement is *against*. Critics complain, however, that they cannot always identify what it stands *for*, and what practical alternatives it proposes' (630; Hintjens' emphasis).
- 2) 'The consciousness of a whole new generation of global and local activists has been formed in the school of what might termed "horizontal power". There is a strong antagonism to vanguardism, to knowing better than someone else what is good for them; there is resistance to figureheads who take charge, and an orientation towards those who inspire others to action' (634). This, Hintjens claims, results in a conscientious effort by many involved in this movement to avoid 'over-institutionalising its associational life' (633), which I imagine is debatable and, furthermore, poses challenges for concerns regarding the movement's clarity and accountability.
- 3) Related to (2) above, activists have acknowledge the need to work through participatory channels that can be replicated in some way, although there is an inherent tension in how this can be done without becoming exclusionary. Hintjens points to the variations in participants' attitudes towards institutionalised solutions (e.g., the 'autonomist thinking' of Italian social-justice movements compared with Indian social movements, for whom engagement with the state framework might be more embraced more readily).
- 4) Citing Escobar (2004: 353), Hintjens writes, 'The social movements that make up the Movement of the Movements "do not take their cues from any central committee, but act largely in response to local / national concerns, albeit having in mind some global issues"'.

Reference 9 – Global Advocacy and Social Movements

Newell, P (2008) ‘Civil Society, Corporate Accountability and the Politics of Climate Change’, *Global Environmental Politics* 8(3): 122-53.

Overview

The author explores the evolving strategies of environmentally concerned civil society groups’ engagement with key actors (the corporate sector, consumers and multilateral development banks) to increase environmental accountability within the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change / Kyoto Protocol. In particular, the ‘hybrid regime arrangements’ of many public policies and private interests are highlighted and the challenges that arise as a result analysed. The author draws on a number of short case studies to illustrate his points.

Useful ideas and/or quotations

- 1) The author describes the problem compounded by the unevenness of participation in global environmental decision-making, for both governments of poor countries and civil society groups from those regions – ‘Merely constructing more “spaces” for civil society groups within international institutions does not address the inequalities within civil society that will continue to mean participation is unevenly distributed by region, issue, as well as other social cleavages such as gender, race and class’ (127, citing Newell 2005).
- 2) Newell offers brief cases outlining civil society organisations’ legal activism as a means of holding government (particularly in the US) accountable for environmental degradation. Most of these were characterised by layered coalitions of states, cities and communities (eg, a collection of states in the US – rallied by smaller units of local government and civil society organisations – versus the Environmental Protection Agency in one instance).
- 3) The rising tide of activism aimed directly at the private sector and its responsibilities in addressing climate change can be characterised by two distinct strategies – (a) ‘liberal’ strategies, which attempt to engage and reform business practice, often reliant on market incentives and (b) ‘critical’ strategies, which ‘are more confrontational, employ protest tactics and pose more fundamental challenges to business as usual activities’ (141, citing Newell 2001).
- 4) ‘The forms of accountability that civil regulation often succeeds in producing are often temporary, unenforceable, subject to tokenism and publicity cycles and are as likely to reflect the campaign priorities of vocal or media savvy groups as address the largest and most serious contributors of climate change’ (148).

Reference 8 – Science, Knowledge and Policy

Miller, CA (2007) 'Democratization, International Knowledge Institutions and Global Governance', *Governance* 20(2): 325-57.

Overview

Concerns in democratic theory regarding the need for constraints on the responsible exercise of power are now being felt most acutely in the realm of global governance. The author explores the increase in the creation of 'international knowledge institutions' (eg, IPCC), which he claims are the result of 'nations and publics' exercising constraints on the global institutions of power. The author calls for researchers to pay closer attention to the role of international institutions in 'knowledge making', which he claims frames discourses for a panoply of international challenges.

Useful ideas and/or quotations

- 1) 'The question I pose is whether international institutions can contribute to this broader problem of establishing legitimate limits on the global exercise of power through their ability to structure processes of reasoning and deliberation in global society' (327).
- 2) 'The opening up of international governance to greater deliberations among a wider array of actors has contributed, perhaps not surprisingly, to an increasing preoccupation with struggles over the truth status of knowledge claims and the resources for making those claims more or less believable to diverse publics. In this, global politics increasingly mirrors its domestic counterparts in democratic societies...' (330).
- 3) 'Through the production and certification of knowledge for use in global policymaking, [international knowledge institutions] offer an opportunity to structure global politics so that it is determined not by the will of the most powerful but rather the outcomes of broad processes of deliberation informed by knowledge and reason' (350).

Reference 7 – Rights, Discourse and Identity

Held, D (2005) ‘At the Global Crossroads: The End of the Washington Consensus and the Rise of Global Social Democracy’, *Globalizations* 2(1): 95-113

Overview

The author examines the limitations of the Washington Consensus and proposes alternatives centred on a human security doctrine. This doctrine focuses on strengthening multilateral institutions, international law and remedying the gap between economic growth and social justice. Held criticises the Washington Consensus, yet claims that the econ-centric phase of globalization recently underway can be reorganised to enhance development and security for a greater number of people.

Useful ideas and/or quotations

- 1) ‘We no longer live, if we ever did, in a world of discrete national communities. Instead, we live in a world of what I like to call “overlapping communities of fate” where the trajectories of countries are deeply enmeshed with each other. In our world, it is not only the violent exception that links people together across borders; the very nature of everyday problems and processes joins people in multiple ways’ (95).
- 2) ‘In the current era, social democracy must be defended and elaborated not just at the level of the nation-state, but at the regional and global levels as well. The provision of public goods can no longer be equated with state-provided goods alone. Diverse state and non-state actors shape and contribute to their provision—and they need to do so if some of the most profound challenges of globalization are to be met’ (103-4).
- 3) Held outlines what is effectively a bullet-pointed list of specific issues to be addressed for achieving an international order rooted in social democratic principles rather than the dominant orthodoxies imposed by the Washington Consensus. It should be noted that there are fundamental principles of the Washington Consensus, ‘ingredients’ in a sense, that Held claims could be useful, albeit transplanted to a more social democratic framework.
- 4) Interestingly, Held concludes with a suggestion that Europe could play a unique role in realigning the global order to something more socially democratic (although not without having examined earlier in the article Europe’s role in unfavourable trade policies, involvement in the war on terror, etc.). Perhaps what is interesting is that Held recommends Europe consider strategically the domestic components of US politics that require special attention if a more social democratic global order is to emerge. Though he doesn’t draw the point clearly, the implication regarding the continued weight of national considerations and domestic forces is an interesting contrast with Held’s overall project.

Reference 8 – Rights, Discourse and Identity

Dryzek, JS (2006) ‘Transnational Democracy in an Insecure World’, *International Political Science Review* 27(2): 101-19.

Overview

While liberal multilateralist foundations of global governance may have been disrupted by the US-led invasion of Iraq, other democratic projects have been less damaged. In particular, a ‘transnational discursive democracy’ rooted in the idea of an international public sphere continues to retain importance, according to the author.

Useful ideas and/or quotations

- 1) ‘Transnational discursive democracy rests on the notion that discourses and their interactions are consequential in producing international outcomes through their influence upon and constitution of actors. The democratic question then becomes how dispersed, critical and competent influence can be established.’ This, however, does not mean dispersed or decentralised control will suffice; ‘decentralized control is only democratic to the degree it involves communicative action by critical and competent individuals, acting as citizens and not as consumers, enemies or automatons’ (102).
- 2) Regarding the nascent anti-globalization movement in the 1990s and its increased standing – ‘The cumulative weight of small interventions in the discursive field can be substantial – which is just how it should be in a world of discursive reconstruction’ (106).
- 3) ‘James Thomson, President of the Rand Corporation, has bemoaned the fact that in its “war of ideas” the Bush administration effectively reached the people of the USA, but failed to convince the rest of the world (Guardian Weekly, 2002: 14). However, this failure is not contingent, a result merely of a poor communications strategy. Rather, it follows directly from the communicative aspect of globalization, which means audiences cannot be segmented and given different information and rhetoric’ (107).